



The Gazette of India

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

No. 19] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, MAY 8, 1965/VAISAKHA 18, 1887

Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed
as a separate compilation

नीचे लिखे भारत के असाधारण राजपत्र 27 अप्रैल, 1965 तक प्रकाशित किए गये ।

The undermentioned Gazettes of India Extraordinary were published upto the 27th April, 1965:—

Issue No.	No. and Date	Issued by	Subject
82.	S.O. 1320, dated 22nd April, 1965.	Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.	Approval of films specified therein.
83.	S.O. 1321, dated 22nd April, 1965.	Central Board of Direct Taxes.	Corrigenda to S.O. 1107 dated 1st April, 1965.
84.	S.O. 1322, dated 22nd April, 1965.	Election Commission, India.	List of Contesting Candidates for the Bye election to the House of the People from the Mahbubabad Constituency.
85.	S.O. 1323, dated 24th April, 1965.	Ministry of Steel and Mines.	Authorising that any person may acquire Tin bars etc.
86.	S.O. 1324, dated 26th April, 1965.	Ministry of Commerce.	Recommendations of the Export Inspection Council.
	S.O. 1325, dated 26th April, 1965.	Do.	The Export of P.V.C. Leather Cloth (Inspection) Rules, 1965.
	S.O. 1326, dated 26th April, 1965.	Do.	Recognising the Plastics and Linoleums Export Promotion Council as the agency for inspection of P.V.C. Leather Cloth, prior to export.
87.	S.O. 1327, dated 26th April, 1965.	Ministry of Industry and Supply.	Directing that Order No. S.O. 867 dated 15th May 1958 shall continue to have effect for further two years.

Issue No.	No. and Date	Issued by	Subject.
88.	S.O. 1422, dated 27th April, 1965.	Ministry of Commerce.	Recommendations of the Export Inspection Council.
	S.O. 1423, dated 27th April, 1965.	Do.	Recommendations of the Export Inspection Council.
	S.O. 1424, dated 27th April, 1965.	Do.	The Export of Jute Hessian and Jute Sacking (Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1965.

ऊपर लिखे असाधारण राजपत्रों की प्रतियाँ प्रकाशन प्रबन्धक, सिविल लाइन्स, दिल्ली के नाम मांगपत्र भेजने पर भेज दी जाएंगी। मांगपत्र प्रबन्धक के पास इन राजपत्रों के जारी होने की तारीख से 10 दिन के भीतर पहुँच जाने चाहिए।

Copies of the Gazettes Extraordinary mentioned above will be supplied on indent to the Manager of Publications, Civil Lines, Delhi. Indents should be submitted so as to reach the Manager within ten days of the date of issue of these Gazettes.

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उपखण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ क्षेत्र प्रशासन को छोड़कर) केन्द्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किए गए विधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएँ।

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the Ministry of Defence) and by Central Authorities (other than the Administration of Union Territories).

ELECTION COMMISSION, INDIA

New Delhi, the 27th April, 1965.

S.O. 1430.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13A of the Representation of the People Act, 1950 (43 of 1950), the Election Commission, in consultation with the Administration of Goa, Daman and Diu hereby nominates Shri S. Balakrishnan as the Chief Electoral Officer for Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu with effect from the date he takes over charge and until further orders *vice* Shri A. F. Couto.

[No. 154/21/65.]

S.O. 1431.—In pursuance of section 106 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, the Election Commission hereby publishes the order pronounced on the 2nd April, 1965 by the Election Tribunal, Farrukhabad.

IN THE ELECTION TRIBUNAL AT FARRUKHABAD.

PRESENT:

Sri Sarup Kishan Kaul.—*Member.*

(District Judge, Farrukhabad)

ELECTION PETITION NO. 5 OF 1963.

Sri Nitya Nand.—*Petitioner.*

Versus

1. Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, 2. Dr. B. V. Keskar, 3. Sri Bharat Singh Rathor, 4. Sri Chhedi Lal, 5. Sri Shambhu Nath Dixit, and 6. Sri Raj Narain Dube.—*Respondents.*

JUDGEMENT

This election petition was presented by Sri Nitya Nand Chela Balramdas to Sri A. N. Sen, Under Secretary, Election Commission, India, on 5th July, 1963, principally against respondent No. 1 namely Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia with a prayer that the election of Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia respondent No. 1 be declared null and void and be set aside and that he be dis-qualified to seek election in future. Respondents Nos. 2 to 6 were also impleaded as they had also filed nomination seeking election for Farrukhabad Lok Sabha Parliamentary Constituency. The Election Commission had constituted this Court as Tribunal to decide the petition and after giving notices of hearing to the respondents had transferred the election petition to me for disposal.

It is common ground between the parties that in the last general election of 1962 Pt. Mool Chand Dubey was returned from this Constituency. Pt. Mool Chand Dubey unfortunately expired and as such a vacancy was caused in this Constituency of Farrukhabad. Thereafter the Election Commission decided to hold election for Farrukhabad Lok Sabha Parliamentary constituency and in connection with that respondents Nos. 1 to 6 had filed their nominations.

The allegations of the petitioner are that he is an elector of Farrukhabad Parliamentary Constituency and his name was duly entered in the elector roll of Farrukhabad Legislative Assembly constituency No. 342 part 57 at serial No. 72. He was, thus entitled to file the present election petition. Later on, respondents Nos. 5 and 6 withdrew their nominations. Thereafter contest of the aforesaid election continued between respondent Nos. 1 to 4 alone. The polling for the Farrukhabad Lok Sabha Parliamentary constituency took place on 19th May, 1963 and the counting of votes was done on 21st May, 1963. The result of the counting was as given below:—

1. Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia	1,07,816
2. Dr. Keskar	50,528
3. Sri Bharat Singh Rathore	19,395
4. Sri Chhedi Lal	5,422
5. Votes rejected	4,340
TOTAL	1,87,501

The Returning Officer, thereupon, declared Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia respondent No. 1 as duly elected to this Election. The election of Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, according to the petitioner, was neither fair nor free election. It was void and was liable to be set aside on the grounds namely (i) He had committed the following corrupt practices. (A) Respondent No. 1, his agents and workers published statements of facts which were false to their knowledge and which they themselves did not believe to be true in relation to personal character and conducts of respondents Nos. 2 and 3 relating to their candidature. This amounted to corrupt practices within the definition of section 123(4) of the representation of the People's Act. The instances of the corrupt practices were given and quoted in paragraphs Nos. A(a) (i) to (vii). It was then alleged that respondent No. 1 and with his consent his workers, election agents, agents, workers and supporters spent about 10 lacs of rupees over the election of respondent No. 1. The said expenses had not been shown in the Election expenses of respondent No. 1. On the other hand, a very small amount which was incorrect and false has been shown as expenses in the election expenditure and thereby respondent No. 1 had committed corrupt practice as defined in section 123(6) of the Representation of People's Act. The facts constituting this corrupt practice were detailed in paragraphs Nos. A(a) (viii) to (h).

It was then alleged that respondent No. 1 and with his consent his agents, workers and supporters publicly declared and held out promises that if no vote was cast for the Congress candidate at any polling station the Pradhan of Gaon Samaj of the said polling station would get Rs. 101. It was further promised that suitable memorial will be erected at the said place. At the polling station of Kanjhiana not a single vote was cast for the Congress and, therefore, a sum of Rs. 101 was given by respondent No. 1 and his agent Sri Arjun Singh Bhadauria to Pradhan Gaon Samaj Kanjhiana in performance of the promise made by and on behalf of respondent No. 1. The electors who wanted to vote for respondent No. 2 were intimidated by the workers, supporters, and agents of respondent No. 1 with his consent as well as by Pradhan of Kanjhiana from casting their votes for Congress. The details of instances were given in Schedule "VII".

It was then alleged that respondent No. 1 and with his consent his election agents, agents, workers and supporters made gifts of calendars (Annexure 'K') to the voters with the object of indirectly inducing them to vote for respondent No. 1. Names of some of the voters were mentioned in Schedule No. 'XV'. On account of this illegal gratification the aforesaid voters voted for respondent No. 1. This furthered the election prospects of respondent No. 1 and prejudicially affected the election of respondents Nos. 2 to 4. It was further pleaded that respondent engaged a large number of lady workers for furthering his election prospects. The names of those lady workers were given in Schedule VIII. Respondent No. 1 and with his consent his election agents, the aforesaid lady workers and other supporters appealed to the religious symbol of Banyan tree which was also the symbol of respondent No. 1 in the said election and thereby they exercised undue influence upon the female voters to believe that the symbol of respondent No. 1 represented in Hinduism the husband of the married lady. It was openly declared by respondent No. 1 and with his consent his workers and supporters, agents and election agents that the married Hindu ladies should vote for Banyan tree failing which they would be ruined and grief and spiritual censor would follow. The lady voters were also told that their husbands would die and their family life would be ruined if they did not vote for respondent No. 1 who had the symbol of Banyan tree. By this false propaganda and appeal to religious symbol, respondent No. 1 furthered the prospects of his election and prejudicially affected the election of other candidates.

It was further alleged that respondent No. 1 was Agrawal Vaish by caste. The Vaish community of Farrukhabad district wielded abnormal influence on account of their wealth and position and also being pioneers in trade and industry. The Vaish of other districts and Provinces also came to the help of respondent No. 1. Several meetings were held by respondent No. 1 of the electors of Vaish community and they were systematically appealed to vote for him on the grounds of caste and refrain from casting vote for member of other community. This method furthered the prospects of the election of respondent No. 1 and prejudicially affected the election of other candidates. The details of these meetings were given in Schedule IX.

It was also alleged that the respondent No. 1 and his election agents, workers and supporters made promises to the Government servants that their pay and allowances would be increased if he was elected to the Parliament. Several Government servants canvassed for respondent No. 1 which they were not legally entitled to do. The canvassing of Government servants was done with the consent of respondent No. 1 and with the consent of his election agent Sri Raj Narain Singh. The election of respondent No. 1 was also legally bad on the grounds mentioned in Schedule X.

It was further alleged that respondent No. 1 engaged a number of Sarpanchas of the Nayay Panchayat to work as his election agents. The Sarpanchas engaged by respondent No. 1 and with his consent by his election agents, agents, supporters and workers exercised undue influence of his office upon the voters to cast vote for respondent No. 1. On this ground as well the election of respondent No. 1 was legally bad. The details of these instances relating to this fact were given in Schedule XVIII.

It was further pleaded that respondent No. 1, his election agents, and co-workers imported about 5 or 6 thousands workers from other districts and states who were there-after posted over different polling stations. Ample funds were made available to the aforesaid workers. The workers with the help of this money got control over the local influential people. The said workers and supporters of respondent No. 1 with the consent of respondent No. 1 brought undue influence upon the voters to vote for respondent No. 1 and it was under this undue influence that votes for respondent No. 1 were cast. The details of these facts were given in Schedule XX.

It was further alleged that in the last general election of Parliament, the all India Jansangh party put up Pt. Ram Parsad Sharma as a candidate for election to parliament. The Jansangh party was contemplating to put up one out of Sarvri Ram Parsad Sharma, Kashmir Singh, Bans Gopal, Girish Chand Tewari and Lalji as their candidate for the election under reference. Respondent No. 1 thereupon made an offer to the Jansangh party not to put up any of the aforesaid candidates and in consideration of this withdrawal, the all India Socialist party would not put up its candidate against Sri Deen Dayal Upadhyaya, a candidate for Jansangh from Jaunpur constituency. This corrupt practice, thereupon, furthered the election of respondent No. 1 and thereby prejudicially affected the election of the remaining candidates. The details constituting this corrupt practice were mentioned in Schedule XI in appendix H.

It was then alleged that respondent No. 1 and with his consent his agents and workers hired and procured a large number of bullock-carts, Ekkas, tongas and rickshaws for the conveyance of the electors to and from the polling stations to their home. This was illegal and was done for the furtherance of the election of respondent No. 1 and to prejudicially affect the election of other candidates. The details of this fact were noted in Schedule No. XIII.

It was then alleged that in view of the irregularities and non-compliance of the Act and rules committed at the election quoted in paragraphs Nos. 6-B-III the result of the election was materially affected. It was then alleged that respondent No. 1 and with his consent his election agents, supporters as well as workers held several meetings of the Muslim community and appealed to them on the ground of Muslim religion. They also appealed that if they wanted their co-religionist, muslims of Kashmir to be freed from the burden and if they wanted independent Kashmir and release of Sheikh Abdulla, they should vote for respondent No. 1. They appealed to the Muslim community on the ground of religion which furthered the election prospects of respondent No. 1 and prejudicially affected the election of other candidates. The then Chief Minister of Kashmir Bakhshi Gulam Mohammad came to this district. He had held a meeting at Farrukhabad and appealed to the voters to vote for respondent No. 2. Respondent No. 1 finding that the voters and specially Muslim voters had become favourable to respondent No. 2 got notice given in Appendix 'J' published and appealed to the religious susceptibilities of Muslims and asked them to vote for respondent No. 1. The notices, pamphlets and meetings prejudicially affected the election prospects of respondent No. 2 and respondent No. 3. The details of these things were given in Schedule XIV.

It was then alleged that a public meeting by the Congress party, the details of which were given in Schedule XVI was called to appeal to the voters to vote for the Congress. In the said meeting the agents, workers and supporters of respondent No. 1 with his consent excited the public present in the meeting to act in a disorderly manner for the purposes of preventing the transaction of the business for which the meeting was called. This action amounted to corrupt practice within the meaning of section 100(D)(IV).

It was then alleged that every candidate who sought election was bound to send a copy of the notice, posters, pamphlets and leaflets printed and published for the election bound by him or with his consent by his worker and agents to the Election Officer and the District Magistrate of the district. Respondent No. 1 committed a breach of this rule and had thus committed a corrupt practice within the meaning of section 100(i)(D)(IV) of the Representation of People's Act, 1951.

It was also alleged that respondent No. 1 did not maintain an account as required under section 77 of the Representation of People's Act. Hence the return of election expenditure filed by him was invalid and not the true copy of the account. It was also alleged that the return was not lodged in legal and proper form. On these grounds the petitioner sought the election of respondent No. 1 to be declared null and void and further sought the relief that respondent No. 1 be disqualified to seek election in future. He also claimed costs of the petition.

Respondents Nos. 2 to 6 did not contest the petition, in spite of sufficient service. They also did not file any written statement. The petition was contested by respondent No. 1. The pleas raised in defence were that the petitioner was not the elector from Farrukhabad Parliamentary Constituency. It was also denied that the name of the petitioner was entered in the electoral roll relating to Farrukhabad Legislative Assembly constituency at serial No. 72 or at any other place. It was alleged that the electoral roll filed by the petitioner along with the petition did not relate to him and as such the petitioner was not entitled to file the petition. It was then alleged that there was no person of the name 'Nityanand Chela Balramdas'. Even the petitioner had not dared to sign the petition as 'Nitya Nand Chela Balramdas'. So far as the respondent No. 1 knew the name of the petitioner was Niranjan Dass Chela Balramdas and not Nitya Nand Chela Balramdas. The use of word Nitya Nand alias Niranjan Dass was erroneous and the petitioner was not an elector within the meaning of section 81 of the Representation of People's Act and as such he was not entitled to maintain the petition. On this ground alone the petition was liable to be rejected.

It was further alleged that the petition was not properly presented. It had to be presented to the Secretary, Election Commission India. It was, however, presented to one Sri A. N. Sen, Under Secretary, Election Commission India. It

was denied that Sri A. N. Sen was personally authorized to receive the election petitions by the Election Commission. The result of the election as noted in paragraph No. 3 of the petition was admitted. It was alleged that the respondent No. 1 was not a Congress candidate but was a candidate of the Socialist Party. Rest of the contents of paragraph No. 4 were not admitted. The contents of paragraph No. 5 of the petition were admitted. The contents of paragraph No. 6 of the petition along with their clauses and sub-clauses were denied. It was further alleged that the contents of para. No. 6-A of the petition were completely false. Respondent No. 1 denied having committed any corrupt practices. The contents of paragraph No. 6-A(a) together with all its clauses and sub-clauses were denied to be correct but were alleged to be false. Respondent No. 1 denied that he, or his election agents, agents and workers got published any statement in 'Chaukhamba' in relation to personal character and conduct of respondents Nos. 2 and 3 in relation to their candidature. It was also denied that any statements were published by the respondent No. 1 his election agents, agents, workers and supporters in order to prejudicially affect the prospects of the election of respondents Nos. 2 & 3. It was denied that respondent No. 1 was guilty of any corrupt practices defined in section 123(4) of the Representation of People's Act. The contents of paragraph No. 6-A(a)(i) along with Schedule I of the petition were alleged to be false, and denied. Respondent No. 1 admitted to be one of the founders of the Socialist party of India. It was denied that he or his election agents or any of his workers, agents etc. were connected with the publication of newspaper 'Chaukhamba' on 4th May 1963 or on any other date. As far as he knew each news was published and printed on papers by the editor at Indore, who were not even agents, workers or supporters of the respondent No. 1. It was denied that he or his election agents, workers or supporters with his consent or otherwise knew the items mentioned in this paragraph and published in 'Chaukhamba' on 4th May 1963 or on any other date. Respondent No. 1 denied that he or his election agents, workers and supporters with his consent or otherwise circulated widely or distributed at any place papers on the dates mentioned in Schedule I or on any other date. It was denied that Sri Raj Narain Singh or any other person mentioned in Schedule I distributed those papers on those dates or on any other date. It was alleged that the allegations about corrupt practices did not amount to corrupt practices as mentioned in section 123(4) of the said Act. It was alleged that in any case the contents of this paragraph were vague and were liable to be struck off under Order 6 rule 16 C.P.C. The contents of paragraph No. 6-A(ii) were alleged to be wrong. It was denied that respondent No. 1, his agents, election agents workers or supporters with his consent or otherwise had made a statement in general public or in public meeting that respondent No. 3 had accepted Rs. 25000/- from respondent No. 2 for getting respondent No. 1 defeated and respondent No. 2 elected at the election. It was then alleged that this paragraph also was vague and was also liable to be struck off under order 6 rule 16 C.P.C. It was denied that he or any of the persons mentioned in Schedule I ever made a statement that respondent No. 2 had paid a sum of Rs. 25000/- to respondent No. 3. It was further denied that such statement was made by him or his agents, workers and supporters in order to defame respondents Nos. 2 and 3 in the opinion the voters. It was denied that any such statement had affected adversely the election of respondents Nos. 2 and 3. The contents of paragraph No. 6-A(a)(iii) were alleged to be false and denied. It was alleged that so far as he knew respondent No. 6 had never been Secretary of the Farrukhabad Socialist Party. It was denied that respondent No. 6 was taken in Socialist Party by respondent No. 1 before the election. It was also denied that respondent No. 6 worked for respondent No. 1. It was alleged that respondent No. 6 was very ill through out the period of election. It was admitted that respondent No. 6 was editor of paper 'Chattan'. It was denied that respondent No. 1 or any one on his behalf had anything to do with publication of the aforesaid paper. It was denied that the aforesaid paper was monopolized by respondent No. 1. It was denied that any payments were made to respondent No. 6. It was admitted that some of the leaflets were published in the press belonging to respondent No. 6 for which payment was made. It was denied that the said paper had become an important paper for the election of respondent No. 1 or the Socialist Party. It was also denied that respondent No. 6 had close relations with Sri Raj Narain Singh. As far as he knew paper 'Chattan' was in the list of the U.P. Govt. and many advertisements used to be sent to this paper for publication by the various departments of the Uttar Pradesh Govt. and U.P. Govt. was under the control of Congress party. Respondent No. 2 was also a candidate of the Congress party. This paper was published to perpetuate the memory of Pt. Mool Chand Dubey, who was an ex-Congress M.P. from this constituency. It was denied that any news were got published in paper 'Chattan' dated 1st April 1963, 15th April 1963 and 13th May 1963 by respondent No. 1 or with his consent by his agents, workers or supporters. It

was also denied that the said newspaper dated 13th May 1963 or of any other date was distributed by his supporters, agents or workers or by respondent No. 1 or any other persons mentioned in Schedule I-A. It was denied that the news-items published in said newspaper on 1st April 1963, 15th April 1963 and 13th May 1963 were false or that these news in any way prejudiced the election of respondents No. 2 and 3. It was denied that the persons mentioned in Schedule I-A except Sri Raj Narain Singh were agents of respondent No. 1. It was then alleged that the contents of this para and schedule I-A were vague and lacked in particulars and as such this paragraph was liable to be struck under Order 6 rule 16 C.P.C. It was then alleged that in any case the allegations contained in this paragraph did not make out a case for setting aside the election under section 100 of the said Act. The contents of paragraph 6-A(IV) of the petition were alleged to be wrong and were denied. It was denied that Sri Arjun Singh Bhadoria got published the leaflet underneath 'Dosto hoshiaar raho'. It was alleged that it was meant merely to criticize the Congress and Praja Socialist Party. The said leaflets did not contain anything which could come under the definition corrupt practice within the meaning of section 123(4) of the Act. Respondent No. 1 denied having distributed the leaflets himself or through the persons mentioned in schedule II of the petition. It was denied that it was distributed with his consent. It was then alleged that the contents of this paragraph together with Schedule II were vague and lacked in particulars and as such liable to be struck off under order 6 rule 16 C.P.C. The contents of paragraph 6-A(a)(V) were alleged to be wrong and denied. It was denied that Sarvri Madhulimay, Raj Narain Singh, Arjun Singh Bhadoria and Ram Sewak Yadav were members of the U.P. Legislative assembly. It was denied that the aforesaid persons as mentioned in Schedules 3 and 4 gave out or published a statement that Sri Bharat Singh Rathore had been paid Rs. 25000/- by the Congress in order to stand him as a candidate in the election. It was then alleged that this paragraph along with contents of Schedules 3 and 4 were vague and lacked in particulars and as such were liable to be struck off under order 6 rule 16 C.P.C. It was further alleged that in any case no ground for setting aside the election under section 100 of the Act was made out from the allegations contained in this para and this plea was liable to be ignored.

The contents of para 6-A(a)(vi) were alleged to be wrong. It was denied that the two pamphlets mentioned in Annexure 'E' were published by the agents, workers and supporters of respondent No. 1 or that these were published with his consent. It was also alleged that the contents of these pamphlets did not come within the definition of corrupt practice as defined under section 123(4) of the Act. It was also pleaded that the contents of this para were vague and lacking in particulars and as such were liable to be struck off under order 6 rule 16 C.P.C. It was also alleged that the allegations of this para did not and could not afford a ground for setting aside the election under section 100 of the aforesaid Act.

The contents of para 6A(a)(vii) were denied. It was denied that the notices mentioned in annexure 'F' and 'G' were printed and published by respondent No. 1 or his election agent, agents, workers and supporters. It was also alleged that the contents of these two annexures did not constitute a corrupt practice. It was denied that the persons named in the Schedule distributed the said notices on the dates and places mentioned therein or on any other dates and places. It was denied that he or his election agents distributed the aforesaid notices or consented to the distribution or publication of the same. It was also alleged that these allegations being vague and lacking in particulars were liable to be struck off under order 6 rule 16 C.P.C.

The contents of para 6-A(a)(viii) together with sub-clauses were denied. It was denied that Rs. 10 lacs were spent in the election. It was then denied that a few lacs were received through post office, State Bank, Central Bank, Punjab National Bank or other State. It was denied that any such amount was spent in the election of respondent No. 1. It was alleged that the return of expenditure filed by him was correct. It was denied that he had shown incorrect or false account of his election expenses. It was further pleaded that these allegations being vague he could not be held guilty of any corrupt practice on this ground.

The contents of para 6-A(a)(viii)(a) were denied and said to be wrong. It was alleged that this paragraph being vague and lacking in particulars was liable to be struck off under order 6 rule 16 C.P.C. It was denied that he or the persons mentioned in Schedule XVII distributed the annexure G, C, E, K, L, as alleged. It was denied that he or his workers or agents with his consent had spent any amount in printing or distribution of the aforesaid leaflets and notices. Similarly, the allegations of paragraph 6-A(a)(viii)(b) were denied. It was

alleged that these particulars were vague and were liable to be struck off under Order 6 rule 16 C.P.C. The allegations contained in paragraph No. 6-A(a)(viii)(c) were denied. It was denied that expenses to the tune of Rs. 50,000/- at the rate of Rs. 100/- per polling station for the stencelling of the appeal to the voters were incurred by the respondent No. 1. It was alleged that the stencilling on the walls was done by the sympathisers or the voters themselves free of expenses and he did not spend any amount over the same.

The contents of paragraph No. 6-A(a)(viii)(d) were alleged to be false and denied. It was denied that any telephonic connection in the name of Sri Jaswant Singh Secretary of Socialist Party was taken by him. It was alleged that the Socialist Party of Farrukhabad had telephone itself which was even working today. No telephone was taken for the purposes of election by him. No expenditure on this account was incurred by him nor did he authorize any one to incur any expenditure on this account. It was denied that any expenses were incurred by him or with his consent by his agents, workers or supporters at telephone or trunk-call. It was then alleged that these pleas were vague and lacking in particulars and as such liable to be struck off under order 6 rule 16 C.P.C.

The contents of paragraph (viii)(e) were said to be false and denied. It was denied that there was any voucher No. 232. It was denied that any expenditure was concealed with respect to voucher No. 101. It was alleged that the return of the election expenditure was correct.

The contents of paragraph (viii)(f) were denied. It was denied that six thousands workers for a month at various polling stations were engaged by respondent No. 1. It was denied that respondent No. 1 concealed the amount of 3 lacs spent on this account. It was alleged that the particulars being vague in law the paragraph was liable to be struck off under order 6 rule 16 C.P.C.

The contents of paragraph 6-A(a)(viii)(g) were denied and were said to be false. It was alleged that this paragraph being vague and lacking in particulars was liable to be struck off under Order 6 rule 16 C.P.C. It was alleged that the election expenditure shown by him on this account was perfectly correct and nothing had been concealed.

The contents of paragraph No. 6-A(a)(viii)(h) were said to be false and denied. It was denied that Rs. 101/- were given, or any other amount was given, to the Pradhan of Gaon Samaj Kanjhiana during the period of election.

The contents of paragraph No. 6-A(a)(ix) of the petition were denied. It was denied that on 12th May 1963 or on any date Sri Raj Narain Singh had promised to pay a sum of Rs. 101/- to the Pradhan of Gram Samaj Kanjhiana. The election being over on 6th June 1963, any amount even paid on that date was not the item of expenditure. It was denied that the Pradhan of Kanjhiana Gram Samaj had intimidated any voter who wanted to vote for respondent No. 1. It was denied that any of the workers and agents of the respondents—No. 1 intimidated any voters anywhere either with his consent or otherwise. It was alleged that these particulars being vague, these were liable to be struck off under Order 6 rule 16 C.P.C.

The contents of paragraph No. 6-A(a)(x) together with Schedule XV were denied. It was denied that he or his election agents or Sarvsri Arjun Singh Bhadoria, Jaswant Singh and Raj Narain Dube or any one else with the consent of respondent No. 1 or otherwise distributed calendars (Annexures K) or made any gift of them on the dates & places mentioned in Schedule XV or on any other date to Sarvsri Babu Ram, Banshi, Shahjadey Lal, Shyam Narain and Ram Chandra or to any other person or persons. It was denied that he knew the persons named in column two of the Schedule XV. It was denied that any votes were procured by any payment of illegal gratification. It was alleged that in any case giving of calendars did not in any way amount to illegal gratification. It was alleged that in any case giving of a calendar like annexure K to 5 voters, if any, could not affect the result of the election.

The contents of paragraph 6-A(a)(xi) were denied. It was denied that he or with his consent his agent, election agents and workers or other person exercise undue influence over the female voters in the manner as alleged. It was alleged that the names of the lady workers given in column 1 of Schedule VII were not the names of his agents, as some of them even did not exist. It was alleged that the allegation being vague and lacking in particulars these were liable to be struck off under Order 6 rule 16 C.P.C.

The contents of paragraph No. 6-A(a)(xii) were denied. It was denied that he or Sri Raj Narain Singh or Sri Arjun Singh Bhadoria organized any meeting of the electors of the Vaish Community. It was denied that Vaish of other districts or state had come to help him. It was denied that he had appealed to the Vaish community to vote for him on the ground of caste or community. It was also denied that the persons mentioned in Schedule IX were his agents or workers. It was denied that they wielded influence amongst the voters. It was finally pleaded that the particulars being vague these were liable to be struck off under Order 6 rule 16 C.P.C.

The contents of paragraph 6-A(a)(xiii) and Schedule X of the petition were denied. It was denied that he or his election agents, workers or supporters told the Govt. servants that their pay and allowances would be increased if he was elected. It was also denied that Shri Banshidhar, Sarvri Uma Shanker, Kailash Nath, Executive Officer Kanauj and Head Constable and other constables of Chauki Muras canvassed for the respondent No. 1 or took any part in his election. It was denied that any canvassing was done or favour shown to him by any of the Govt. servants. It was alleged that the Govt. servants did not leave any stone unturned to defeat him. It was denied that any of the persons mentioned in Schedule X worked for him in the election. It was then alleged that the pleas being vague and lacking in particulars these were liable to be struck off under Order 6 rule 16 C.P.C.

The allegations of paragraph No. 6-A(a)(xiv) were denied. It was denied that Shri Lakhan Singh is the Sarpanch of Nayay Panchayat Bhunna. It was denied that Sri Lakhan Singh or Shri Ram Gupta exercised undue influence upon the voters to vote for respondent No. 1. It was alleged that the Sarpanchas of Nayay Panchayat were not Govt. servants and the mere fact that they worked as his polling agents did not afford any ground for setting aside the election. It was denied that they threatened the voters with injury in case they did not vote for him. It was alleged that the allegations contained in this paragraph did not afford any ground for setting aside the election under section 100 of the said Act. It was pleaded that the contents being vague and lacking in particulars these were liable to be struck off under Order 6 rule 16 C.P.C.

The contents of paragraph No. 6-A(a)(xv) were denied. It is denied that he imported 5 or 6 thousand workers from outside or provided ample funds to them to influence the local people. It was alleged that the allegations being lacking in particulars and being vague these were liable to be struck off under Order 6 rule 16 C.P.C.

The contents of paragraph 6-A(a)(xvi) and Schedule XI of the petition were denied. It was denied that the Jan Sangh was contemplating to put up one of Sarvri Ram Prasad Sharma, Kashmir Singh, Bans Gopal, Grish Chandra and Lalji as their candidate in this election. It was denied that he made any offer to Jan Sangh not to put up any candidate against him and that the Socialist Party would not put up any candidate against Sri Din Dayal Upadhyaya in Jaunpur on a promise as alleged in this paragraph. It was alleged that the allegations of this paragraph and Schedule XI did not amount to any corrupt practice within the meaning of section 123(4) of the Act.

The allegations of paragraph No. 6-A(a)(xvii) and Schedule XIII were denied. It was denied that any conveyance was ever hired or procured by Shri Raj Narain Singh and Sri Arjun Singh Bhadoria or any worker of the respondent No. 1 with his consent or otherwise as mentioned in Schedule XIII of the petition. It was alleged that the allegations of this paragraph were vague and lacking in particulars. These were liable to be struck off under Order 6 rule 16 C.P.C.

The contents of paragraph No. 6-B(1) were denied. It was denied that his polling camp was placed within 30 yards of the polling station Suthathi. It was denied that his workers and supporters with his consent or otherwise exercised any undue influence or forcibly removed the voters and made them to vote for him. It was denied that any rules were infringed or that any propaganda was done on his behalf, at the polling booth. It was alleged that the contents of this paragraph being vague and lacking in particulars these were liable to be struck off under Order 6 rule 16 C.P.C.

The contents of paragraph No. 6(B)(II) were denied. It was denied that any polling station was changed. It was denied that any illegality was committed in fixing the camps at the polling station. It was alleged that in any case the election was not materially affected.

The contents of paragraph No. 6(B)(III) were denied and alleged to be incorrect. It was denied that he knew whether respondent No. 4 was the President of the U.P. Republican Party or not. It was alleged that in Uttar Pradesh the Republican Party was not a recognized party by the Election Commission. As soon as the mistake was discovered the Election Commission informed respondent No. 4 that he had been allotted another symbol and not elephant. This fact was duly published by the Election authorities. It was denied that respondent No. 4 had no information about the change of the symbol or that he was not given an opportunity to choose any other symbol. It was alleged that respondent No. 4 was not a serious candidate at all. It was denied that respondent No. 4 had published any posters, pamphlets popularising his symbol. It was denied that any voter had gone to vote for the election symbol 'elephant' and not finding that symbol there voted for the other candidates or came back disappointed. It was alleged that in any case the result of the election was not in any way affected by any of the alleged irregularities.

The contents of paragraph No. 6-B(IV) were denied. It was denied that he or his agents, workers and supporters with his consent or otherwise organized any meeting of the Muslim voters as mentioned in Schedule XIV or at any other place. It was denied that he or any other person with his consent or otherwise appealed to the Muslim electors that if they wanted Muslims of Kashmir to be freed, an independent Kashmir or the release of Sheikh Abdullah they should vote for him. It was denied that any appeal to Muslim voters was made to vote for him on the ground of religion. The entire allegations of this paragraph were denied and alleged to be unfounded as well as false and concocted. It was alleged that in any case the contents of annexure 'J' did not amount to any corrupt practice and could not vitiate his election. It was alleged that the contents of this paragraph and Schedule XIV were vague and as such were liable to be struck off under Order 6 rule 16 C.P.C.

The contents of paragraph No. 6-B(V) were alleged to be wrong. It was denied that Sarvsi Raj Narain Singh, Raj Narain Dubey, Madho Ram and Jaswant Singh or any one else with his consent or otherwise had caused any disturbance in the meeting dated 2nd April 1963 held at Patel Park Farrukhabad. It was alleged that in any case this did not amount to any corrupt practice within the meaning of section 123 of the Act.

The contents of para. No. 6(B)(V) of the petition were denied. It was alleged that even if it might be admitted that he did not submit any copy of the publications mentioned in this paragraph to the District Magistrate no corrupt practice could be said to have been committed, in as much as section 100(1)(D)(IV) of R.P. Act of 1951 did not deal with any corrupt practice. In any case the result of the election could not be materially affected by the alleged non-compliance or breach of this rule.

The contents of paragraph 6(B)(VI) of the petition relating to non-compliance of section 77 was alleged to be a repetition of that charges mentioned above, which was totally false. It was alleged that the return of election expenditure was perfectly valid and in a correct form.

The contents of paragraph No. 7 of the petition were denied. The contents of paragraph No. 8 were also denied. It was alleged that the affidavit filed along with the petition was not a proper and legal affidavit and the petition was liable to be dismissed on that very ground. It was denied that the petitioner was entitled to any relief.

The following issues were framed for determination of this Election Petition:—

Issues

(1)(a). Is the petitioner an elector from Farrukhabad. Parliamentary Constituency within the meaning of section 81 of the Representation of Peoples Act 1951?

(1)(b). Is the petitioner not Sri Nitya Nand alias Niranjana Das? If so, its effect?

(2) Is Sri A. N. Sen authorized to receive petition? If so or not, its effect upon the proper presentation of petition?

(3)(a) Did respondent No. 1, his election agents, workers and supporters get published in the newspaper "Chaukhamba" on 4th May 1963 the news items mentioned in paragraph 6(A)(a) (i) of the petition?

(b) Did respondent No. 1 and with his consent his election agents, workers and supporters get distributed newspaper "Chaukhamba" dated 4th May 1963 on the dates and places mentioned in Schedule I of the petition?

(c) Was the said statement false and was it calculated to assail the personal character, honour, integrity, conduct and veracity of respondents nos. 2 and 3?

(4)(a) Did respondent No. 1 and with his consent his election agents, agents, workers and supporters repeat the said statement thousands of times in general public and public meetings that the respondent No. 3 has accepted Rs. 25,000/- from respondent No. 2 in order to get respondent No. 1 defeated and get respondent No. 2 elected?

(b) Was the said statement made to lower respondents Nos. 2 and 3 in the estimation of the voters and also to show that the said persons were men of no character and it was also made to prejudice the prospects of the election of respondents nos. 2 and 3?

(5)(a) Did respondent No. 1 monopolise the policy of the newspaper "Chattan" by making handsome payment to its Editor, respondent No. 6?

(b) Did the newspaper "Chattan" publish the news items in the paper dated 1st April 1963, 15th April 1963 and 13th May 1963? Were these news items false? Do they mean corrupt practices within the meaning of the Act?

(c) Whether the said paper containing the said news items mentioned above was distributed in the meeting by respondent No. 1?

(6)(a) Did Sri Arjun Singh Bhadoria publish a leaflet *vide* annexure 'D' under the caption "Dosto Hoshiaar Rahen" with the consent of the respondent No. 1? Was the leaflet meant to make out respondents Nos. 2 and 3 as dishonest persons as well as liars and men of no character, having a false profession? If so, its effect?

(b) Was the said leaflet distributed by respondent No. 1 and with his consent by his election agents, workers and agents and other supporters?

(7)(a) Are the persons noted in Schedule III the members of the U.P. Legislative Assembly elected on Socialist ticket and are persons noted in Schedule IV office bearers of Socialist Party U.P. and also other States?

(b) Did the persons mentioned in Schedules III and IV falsely publish the statement that Sri Bharat Singh Rathore has been made to stand as candidate by the Congress and has been paid Rs. 25,000/- for the same? Did this statement prejudice the prospects of the election of respondents Nos. 2 and 3 and was it meant to injure their character? If so, its effect?

(8) Did respondent No. 1 and with his consent his election agents, supporters, workers and agents get printed, published and distributed two pamphlets noted in annexure 'E'? Were these statements false within the knowledge of respondent No. 1 and his agents and workers and were these statements encircled in red made to injure the character of respondents 2 and 3 with a view to prejudice the prospects of the election of the said respondents Nos. 2 and 3?

(9) Whether respondent No. 1 and with his consent his election agents, agents, workers and supporters got printed, published and distributed notices mentioned in Annexure 'F' and 'G'? Did the allegations contained in the said pamphlets amount to corrupt practices within the meaning of the Act and were the said statements false and believed to be false by respondent No. 1 and made to injure the character of respondents Nos. 2 and 3 in order to prejudice their election?

(10) Did respondent No. 1 and with his consent his workers election agents, agents and supporters spend nearly 10 lakhs of rupees over the election of respondent No. 1? Are the accounts of election expenditure filed by the respondent No. 1 false and incorrect?

(11) Whether respondent No. 1 and with his consent his workers, election agents, supporters and agents spent the amount noted in the instances VIII(a) to VIII(h) of the election petition? If so, its effect?

(12) Whether the Pradhan of Gaon Sabha Kanjhiana received a sum of Rs. 101/- from respondent No. 1 and with his consent his agents, workers and supporters to do the acts mentioned in para. IX of the petition?

(13) Whether respondent No. 1 and with his consent his agents, election agents, workers and supporters made gift of calendars (annexure K) to the voters as illegal gratification which induced them to vote for respondent No. 1? If so, its effect?

(14) Did the lady workers of respondent No. 1 *vide* their names given in Schedule VIII with his consent as well as with the consent of his election agents, lady workers and other supporters exercise undue influence on women voters as alleged in para. XI of the petition? If so, its effect.

(15) Whether respondent No. 1 held several meetings of the electors of Vaish Community and appealed to them to vote for him on the ground of caste and community? If so, its effect?

(16) Whether respondent no. 1 and his election agents, workers and supporters made promises to the Govt. servants that their pay and allowances will be increased if respondent No. 1 is elected to the Parliament and was the canvassing done for respondent No. 1 by the persons mentioned in Schedule X on that account? If so, its effect?

(17) Whether respondent No. 1 engaged Sri Lakhan Singh, Sarpanch Nayay Panchayat Bhunna and Shri Sri Ram Gupta, Sarpanch Nayaya Panchayat Yaqutganj, to work as his election agents and did the aforesaid Sarpanchas with the consent of his election agents, agents, supporters and workers exercise undue influence upon the voters to vote for respondent No. 1? If so, its effect?

(18) Did respondent No. 1, his election agents and co-workers import about 5 or 6 thousands workers from other Districts and States and made available to them ample funds with the result that these workers got control over the local influential people and did the said workers, agents and supporters with the consent of respondent No. 1 bring undue influence on the electors to vote for respondent No. 1? If so, its effect?

(19) Did respondent No. 1 make an offer to Jansangh Party not to put up any candidate at the election and in consideration of this withdrawal the Socialist Party was not to put up a candidate against Sri Din Dayal Upadhyaya, a candidate of Jansangh Party from Jaunpur Constituency? Does this offer amount to corrupt practice within the meaning of the Act? If so, its effect?

(20) Whether respondent No. 1 and with his consent his agents and workers hired and procured a large number of bullock-carts, ekkas, tongas and rickshaws for conveyance of voters to and from polling stations to their home? Did this act prejudicially effect the election of other candidates? If so, its effect?

(21) Was the result of the election materially effected on account of non-compliance of the Act and Rules in view of the irregularities mentioned in paras. 6(B)(i) to 6(B)(iii) of the election petition?

(22) Whether respondent No. 1 and with his consent his election agents, agents, supporters and workers held several meetings of the Muslim religion as alleged in para. 6(B)(4) of the petition? If so, its effect?

(23)(a) Whether the agents, workers and supporters of respondent No. 1 with his consent acted in disorderly manner in a public meeting of the Congress as mentioned in Schedule XVI? If so, does it amount to a corrupt practice and did it materially effect the result of the election?

(b) Is it a ground for setting aside the election?

(24) Did respondent No. 1 commit a breach of the Rules mentioned in paras. 6(B)(5) of the petition? Does it amount to a corrupt practice within the meaning of section 100(a)(D)(IV) of the R.P. Act and can the election be set aside on this ground?

(25) Did respondent No. 1 not maintain the accounts as required under section 77 of the R.P. Act? Was the return of election expenditure filed by him invalid and illegal as well as improper? If so, its effect?

(26) Are the allegations contained in paras. 6(A)(a)(i) to 6(B)(iv) of the petition vague and lacking in particulars as alleged in the written statement? If so, its effect?

(27) Do the allegations contained in paragraphs 6(A)(a)(I), (II), (III), 6(A)(a)IV, V, VI, VII and IX, 6(A)XIV, XVI, 6B(IV), 6(B)(II) and 6(B)(VI) afford a ground as alleged in the written statement? If not, its effect?

(28) To what relief, if any, is the petitioner entitled?

(29) Whether newspaper 'Chaukhamba' is the official news-paper of the Socialist Party? If so, its effect?

(30) Whether newspaper 'Chattan' is mouth-piece of Socialist Party as well as that of respondent No. 1? If so, its effect?

The petitioner inspite of several adjournments did not lead any evidence nor did he turn. On behalf of Respondent No. 1 also no evidence was adduced.

Findings

Issue No. (1)(a) and (b).—Both these issues can be taken up together as these are, more or less, interconnected. Ext. 1 which is the voters' list goes to show that at serial No. 72 the name of Nitya Nand—Balram Das is mentioned. The allegations of the petitioner are that he happens to be Nitya Nand Chela Baba Balramdas. In support of this allegation the petitioner has filed Ext. 3 which is a copy of the application given in Misc. case No. 79/69 of 1957 by Baba Balramdas in the Court of Sri Ram Behari Lal, Civil Judge. In paragraph No. 3 it is clearly mentioned that he had adopted Sri Nitya Nand as his 'Chela' and he had changed his name into Baba Niranjan Das. Ext. 5 is the copy of an application given to the Executive Officer Municipal Board Farrukhabad on 5th January 1949 by the petitioner in which his name is mentioned as Nitya Nand *alias* Baba Niranjan Das Chela Baba Balram Das. Ext. 6 is a copy of the order of the Munsif Haveli dated 1st February 1961 in Misc. case No. 170/60 in original suit No. 66 of 1959 in which the name of the defendant is mentioned as Nitya Nand 'jo ki apne ko Baba Niranjan Das Chela Baba Balramdas Kahta hai'. Ext. 7 is a copy of plaint filed in suit No. 24 of 1960 in the Court of the Civil Judge Farrukhabad in which the name of the defendant is mentioned as Sri Nitya Nand Sharma son of Baba Balram Das. Ext. 10 is a copy of the execution application No. 81 of 1963 moved by the Union of India in which the name of the judgment-debtor is mentioned as Nitya Nand Sharma now *alias* Baba Niranjan Das son of Balramdas. Ext. 11 is a slip in lieu of a licence form which goes to show that Niranjan Das Chela Balramdas was given a licence. In Execution case No. 81/1963 there is a report of Sri S. K. Pahar in which it is mentioned that one Nitya Nand son of Jwala Prasad is now Chela of Baba Balramdas. He is now known as Niranjan Das. In my view, therefore, this documentary evidence which is not controverted from the other side leaves no room for doubt that the petitioner is known as Nitya Nand *alias* Niranjan Das Chela Balramdas and that he was elector from Farrukhabad Parliamentary Constituency within the meaning of Section 81 of the Representation of Peoples' Act, 1951? Both the parts of issue No. 1 are decided accordingly.

Issue No. (2).—The present petition was presented to Sri A. N. Sen, Under Secretary, Election Commission, India. It has not been shown from the side of the opposite-party why his authority to receive the petition should not be believed. This issue is decided against respondent No. 1.

Issue No. 3(a).—The burden of proof was upon the petitioner. He did not adduce any evidence on this score. This issue is, therefore, liable to be decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 3(b).—The burden of proof was upon the petitioner to prove this fact. He has not adduced any evidence on this fact. This issue is also liable to be decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 3(c).—The burden of proof was upon the petitioner to prove this fact. In any case in view of my findings on issues Nos. 3(a) and 3(b) this fact also being not proved the issue is decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 4(a).—The burden of proof was upon the petitioner to prove this fact. He has not adduced any evidence on this point. This issue is, therefore, decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 4(b).—In view of my findings on issue No. 4(a) it is clear that this plea cannot be held in favour of the petitioner. On the other hand, there is also no evidence to prove this fact. Consequently, this issue is also liable to be decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 5(a).—The petitioner has not adduced any evidence to show that the policy of paper "Chattan" was monopolised by respondent No. 1. There is no evidence to prove payment to the editor respondent No. 6. The issue is decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 5(b).—There is no proof to prove the news-items as alleged. No evidence has been adduced by the petitioner on this point. The issue is, therefore, liable to be decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 5(c).—The burden of proof was upon the petitioner to prove this fact. He has not adduced any evidence to discharge this burden. This issue is liable to be decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 6(a).—The petitioner has not adduced any evidence in proof of this fact. The issue is, therefore, liable to be decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 6(b).—It was upon the petitioner to prove this fact that such distribution by respondent No. 1 and with his consent by his election agents, workers and agents and other supporters was made. He has not discharged that burden. The issue therefore, is decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 7(a).—There is no proof adduced by the petitioner on this fact. This issue is, therefore, decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 7(b).—There is no proof to show that the persons mentioned in Schedule III and IV published any such statements. Consequently, this issue is also liable to be decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 8.—No evidence having been adduced by the petitioner on this fact and the burden of proof being upon him, this issue is liable to be decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 9.—The burden of proof was upon the petitioner to prove this fact. He has not adduced any evidence on this point. This issue is decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 10.—The petitioner having not adduced any evidence on this score, this issue is decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 11.—The petitioner has not adduced any evidence in proof of this fact. This issue is, therefore, decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 12.—There is no evidence adduced from the side of the petitioner in proof of this fact. This issue is liable to be decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 13.—The burden of proof lay upon the petitioner and he having not adduced any evidence to discharge that burden, the issue is decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 14.—The burden of proof was upon the petitioner and no evidence having been adduced from his side, this issue is decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 15.—The petitioner having not adduced any evidence on this score and the burden of proof being upon him this issue is decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 16.—There being no evidence adduced on this point from the side of the petitioner upon whom the burden lay to prove the same, this issue is liable to be decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 17.—There being no evidence on this point adduced from the side of the petitioner, this issue is also decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 18.—The petitioner having not adduced any evidence on this score, this issue is decided against him.

Issue No. 19.—The petitioner having not adduced any evidence on this score, the issue is decided against him.

Issue No. 20.—The burden of proof was upon the petitioner to prove this fact and he having not discharged the same the issue is decided against him.

Issue No. 21.—The burden of proof was upon the petitioner of this fact. He having not discharged that burden this point does not arise. The issue is decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 22.—The burden to prove this point lay upon the petitioner and he having not discharged that burden the issue is decided against him.

Issue No. 23(a).—No evidence having been adduced from the side of the petitioner, the issue is decided against him.

Issue No. 23(b).—In view of my findings on issue No. 23(a) there is no need to give any finding on this issue.

Issue No. 24.—The petitioner having not adduced any evidence on this issue, it is liable to be decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 25.—The burden of proof lay upon the petitioner and he having not discharged that burden the issue is decided against him.

Issues Nos. 26 and 27.—Both these issues were made the preliminary issues and these were decided by me on 4th January 1964. Copy of the findings shall be incorporated in this judgment.

Issue No. 29.—The burden of proof was upon the petitioner to prove this fact. He has not adduced any evidence in support of this fact. The issue is decided against him.

Issue No. 30.—The burden of proof was upon the petitioner to prove this point. He has not discharged this burden. The issue is decided against him.

Issue No. 28.—In view of my findings given above, I am of this view that this election petition is liable to be dismissed. I also find that the petitioner has failed to prove that any corrupt practices had been committed either by respondent No. 1 or by any one against whom allegations were made from the side of the petitioner. Respondent No. 1 will get costs of this petition from the petitioner including pleaders' fee which I assess at Rs. 500/- Respondent No. 1 shall recover costs from the amount of security so deposited by the petitioner in this petition.

ORDER

The Election petition is dismissed. Respondent No. 1 will get costs of this petition from the petitioner including pleaders' fee which I assess at Rs. 500/-. Respondent No. 1 shall recover costs from the amount of security so deposited in this petition by the petitioner. The petitioner has failed to prove that respondent No. 1 committed any corrupt practice or that any one committed corrupt practices about whom allegations were made in the petition.

(Sd.) S. K. KAUL,

Member, Election Tribunal,
Farrukhabad.

2-4-1965.

Judgment signed, dated and pronounced in the open court.

(Sd.) S. K. KAUL,

Member, Election Tribunal,
Farrukhabad.

2-4-1965.

Copy of findings of Issue No. 27 & 26 with findings in Election Petition No. 5 of 1963 Sri Nitya Nand Vs. Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia and others.

Findings

Issue No. 27:

The argument advanced from the side of the respondent No. 1 was that even if the allegations made out in these paragraphs of the petition are accepted as correct or proved, still these do not afford a ground to the petitioner to set aside the election of respondent No. 1. It was urged that I should give a finding that these grounds do not come within the definition of corrupt practices and as such these paragraphs should be struck off in as much as if evidence was allowed to be led with respect to the allegations made out in these paragraphs and then a finding was given that these grounds do not amount to corrupt practices, it would involve unnecessary expenditure to the parties as well as waste of time in as much as witnesses will be produced in number in support or disproof of these allegations, I am afraid, I do not agree with this contention advanced from the side of the respondent No. 1 to give a finding today categorically whether these grounds come within the definition of corrupt practices or not and do these afford a ground to the petitioner to get the election of respondent No. 1 set aside. It is significant to note that all these allegations are allegations of fact and are not such allegations which could be deemed as allegations of law which require preliminary hearing which might decide the petition one way or the other. Piece-meal decision of some grounds leaving the others open cannot be deemed to be feasible in as much as evidence still will have to be led in this case with respect to other allegations made out in the petition with the result that the petition cannot be dismissed *in limine*

at the stage. Assuming for a moment that some of these grounds are held by me as an amounting to corrupt practices and others are not so held it would mean an expression of opinion on fact one way or the other which would afford a ground to the parties to go up in appeal and this in other words would mean expenditure and taking up too much time, for it may be that the appellate court may come to a different conclusion necessitates remand. This precisely had to be avoided in such petitions inasmuch as it is desirable that all points should be thrashed out at one sitting and evidence taken down at one sitting and not piece-meal. Their Lordships of the Supreme Court in the case of Raj Krushna Bose Vs. Binod Kanungo and others reported in E.L.R. Volume 9 page 294 had an occasion to make an observation on similar lines indicating the manner in which the election petitions have to be disposed off by Tribunal. In that case although 12 issues were framed only two issues were decided by the Tribunal on the basis on which the petition was allowed and the remaining issues were left undecided. Their Lordships observed at page 299 that "We wish to record our disapproval of the way in which this Tribunal shirked its work and tried to take a short-cut. It is essential that these Tribunals should do their work in full. They are *ad hoc* bodies to which remands cannot easily be made as in ordinary courts of law a number of allegations were made in the petition about corrupt and illegal practices, undue influence and bribery. It was the duty of the Tribunal not only to enquire into those allegations, as it did, but also to complete the enquiry by recording findings about those allegation and either condemn or clear the candidate of the charges made." It is therefore clear that following the observations of their Lordships of the Supreme Court it is not desirable to express an opinion one way or the other at this stage when evidently evidence will have to be led in any case on other points involved in this petition.

In another case their Lordships of the Supreme Court observed on Balwant Singh Vs. Lakeshmi Narain and others reported in E.L.R. Volume 22 page 273 at page 280 that "By the Representation of the People Act, 1951, as amended by Act 27 of 1956, a penalty of dismissal of a petition or the striking out of the plea of a corrupt practices namely because particulars in that behalf are not set out is not imposed. By section 90 clause (5) of the Act the Tribunal is authorised to allow particulars of any corrupt practice alleged in the petition, to be amended or amplified in such manner as may, in its opinion, be necessary for ensuring a fair and effective trial of the petition. By section 90 (1) of the Act every election petition is, subject to the provisions of the Act and Rules made thereunder to be tried, as nearly as may be, in accordance with the procedure applicable under the Civil Procedure Code to the trial of suits; and for failure to furnish particulars after being so ordered, but not before, the Tribunal may strike out a defective plea. The practice to be followed in cases where insufficient particulars of a corrupt practice are set forth in an election petition is this. An election petition is not liable to be dismissed *in limine* merely because full particulars of a corrupt practice alleged in the petition, are not set out. Where an objection is raised by the respondent that a petition is defective because full particulars of an alleged corrupt practice are not set out, the Tribunal is bound to decide whether the objection is well founded. If the Tribunal upholds the objection, it should give an opportunity to the petitioner to apply for leave to amend or amplify the particulars of the corrupt practice alleged; and in the event of non-compliance with that order the Tribunal may strike out the charges which remain vague. Insistence upon full particulars of corrupt practices its undoubtedly of paramount importance in the trial of an election petition, but if the parties go to trial despite the absence of full particulars of the corrupt practice alleged, and evidence of the contesting parties is led on the plea raised by the petition, the petition cannot thereafter be dismissed for want of particulars, because the defect is one of procedure and not one of jurisdiction of Tribunal to adjudicate upon the pleas in the absence of particulars."

We find that in the other preliminary issue namely 26 the contention of respondent No. 1 was that particulars were vague and lacking. Consequently there two things cannot be separated in as much as I cannot be asked to declare that the allegations contained in paras. Noted in issue No. 27 do not afford a ground to the petitioner nor do these come under corrupt practices and at the same time allow the petition or give my finding on issue No. 26, that such and such particulars or lacking or whether amplification of those particulars has to be given or not. It is therefore clear that giving a decision of issue No. 27 at this stage will neither be feasible nor desirable I have already mentioned above that had this been a legal point it would not involve production of evidence or if this was a point which would have been sufficient in itself to throw out the petition, it would have been imperative on my part to have decided this issue first in as much as if it was found in favour of respondent No. 1 the petition could have been through out. Nothing of the kind is to be found in this case. I am supported in this view by observations of their Lordships of the Supreme Court in the case of K. Kamaraja

Nadar Vs. Kunju Thever and others reported in E.L.R. Volume 14 page 270. In that case the question involved was whether there was sufficient compliance with the provisions of section 117 of R.P. Act and before the Election Tribunal an application was moved that this ground may be made a preliminary objection and be disposed off first. The Election Tribunal however did not decide the preliminary objection but ordered the trial of the petition to proceed. Their Lordships observed at page 296 that "We are of opinion that both the Election Tribunal and the High Court were wrong in the view they took. If the preliminary objection was not entertained and a decision reached thereupon, further proceedings taken in the Election Petition would mean a full fledged trial involving examination of a large number of witnesses on behalf of the second respondent in support of the numerous allegations of corrupt practices attributed by him to the appellant, his other agent working on his behalf, examination of a large number of witnesses by or on behalf of the appellant controverting the allegations made against him it would mean unnecessary harassment and expenses for the appellant which could certainly be avoided if the preliminary objection urged by him was decided at the initial stage by the Election Tribunal."

Now the question involved in that case was that if the preliminary objection could dispose of the petition it should be disposed off first because if it was found in favour of the respondent, it would shut evidence on all other facts because non-compliance of section 117 in itself tantamounted to a dismissal of petition without entering into other facts. As remarked by me above in this case this is not the position. Similarly in the case of S. Pratap Singh Kairon Vs. S. Gurmej Singh reported in E.L.R. Volume 14 page 412 it was observed by their Lordships that if a decision on issue of law could decide part of the case, it should be made a preliminary issue and decided first. Now in that case issue No. 8 related to the position of Lumberdar *vis-a-vis* the Govt. The contention advanced before the election Tribunal was that Lumberdar was not a person in the service of Govt. and consequently if this finding of law was given, it would be unnecessary to enter into facts involved in respect of that issue. Similarly there were two other issues namely issues Nos. 3 and 7 which were tried to be argued out from the side of the respondent to be preliminary issues. Their Lordships observed at page 422 that the necessity for deciding issue no. 7 would arise only if the first part of issue No. 3 (namely, whether it is competent for the petitioner to raise any objection at this stage that the nomination paper filed by Santa Singh should not have been rejected by the returning officer) is decided in favour of the applicant. Issue No. 3 is thus clearly a preliminary issue of law the decision of which would dispose of a part of the case. It is therefore clear that the ruling cited above lays down this proposition that if there are issues of law which could dispose off a part of the case and about which a preliminary objection was taken then these should be made preliminary issues, then Election Tribunal was to dispose off those issues first and not to postpone the decision of these issues. Nothing of the kind is to be found in this case before me.

Consequently after giving my careful consideration I am of this view that it is neither desirable nor feasible to express an opinion one way or the other whether the allegations contained in paragraphs 6(A)(a)(I), 7(II), (III), 6(A)(a) IV, V, VI, VII, and IX, 6(a)XIV XVI, 6B(IV), 6(B)(II) and 6(B) (VI) afford a ground to the petitioner to set aside the election of the respondent No. 1 and whether these came within the definition of corrupt practices or not inasmuch as this being a question of fact it will have to be gone into at an appropriate stage. Moreover about these very allegations a plea was taken about which issue No. 26 is framed that these lack in particulars and were vague. Consequently without giving an opportunity to the petitioner to amplify the particulars in case it is found that these do lack in particulars or that these were vague it would be inequitable to strike off these allegations at this stage. I would therefore hold that the decision of this issue will be given along with other issues when evidence is led by the parties before me in connection with the trial of this petition.

Issue No. 26:

I shall discuss this issue para by para in order to find out whether the allegations made out in these contested paragraphs lack in particulars and are vague or not "6(A)(a)(i):—In this paragraph instances of corrupt practices were given in respect of dates, places and time as mentioned in schedule. On going through this schedule I find that no doubt dates were mentioned but relating to places only the names of towns were mentioned. It was also mentioned as against Sri Ram Sewak Yadava that distribution took place in the entire constituency. As

against Sri Lakhi Singh it was mentioned that distribution was made in the entire area of Ganga Par. As against Sri Ugra Sen and Sri Vash Dev Singh it was mentioned that on such and such dates distribution was made in paraganas of Tirwa and Kannauj. In the case of Bishen Chandra Seth Vs. Election Tribunal (Shahjahanpur) and others reported in E.L.R. 1959 Volume 17 page 196 His Lordship has clearly observed at page 197 that "Learned counsel for the petitioner says that in the Election petition the dates of the commission of the corrupt practices have been vaguely stated by saying that the corrupt practices were committed during the course of Election campaign, and, as regards the places where the corrupt practices were committed, it was stated that they were committed throughout the constituency. There can be no doubt that these allegations were very vague". Similarly in the case of Gahayur Ali Khan vs. Keshav Gupta reported in E.L.R. 1959 volume 16 page 154 their Lordships observed at page 167 that "Saying that it was distributed throughout the constituency is not specifying any place at all". Similarly in another case of Ashfaq Ali Khan Vs. Darshan Singh and others reported in E.L.R. 1959 volume 20 page 136 their Lordships observed that "As regards the place or places where an offensive pamphlet was distributed, it is not enough to allege that it was distributed" throughout the constituency "this would not be sufficient compliance with the provision of section 33(b) of the act as this really does not amount to mentioning any place at all". Thus I hold that in this schedule I amplification must be given by petitioner showing specifically specific places where distribution or utterances in public meetings took place as well as specific dates of those meetings and distributions.

6(A)(a)(ii).—Instances about this are also noted in schedule and as for reasons given above here as well amplification on the lines indicated above should be given by the petitioner.

6(A)(a)(iii).—This relates to circulation of a newspaper "Chattan" dated 1st April 1963, 15th April 1963 and 13th May 1963 instances of circulation of this paper were given in schedule IA. A perusal of this schedule IA goes to show that here as well only towns have been mentioned. For reasons mentioned in connection with schedule I here too amplification should be given by the petitioner noting specific places and dates of such distribution.

6(A)(a)(iv).—In this paragraph distribution of pamphlet was mentioned and instances of this distribution were noted in schedule II. Once again a perusal of schedule IX goes to show that only towns have been mentioned and "Other places of Ganga Par" have been noted. This is vague. Definite places should be given and not the name of a town.

6(A)(a)(v).—This paragraph relates to publication of false statements at places given in schedules II, III, and IV. A perusal of these three schedules goes to show that these schedules also suffer from the same defect inasmuch as only the names of towns have been mentioned. Specific places should be noted and amplification given by the petitioner.

6(A)(a)(vi).—This paragraph relates to publication and distribution of two pamphlets noted in annexure E. Instances of distribution of these pamphlets were given in schedule V. A perusal of this schedule V goes to show that here as well the names of towns have been noted and not the specific places. I may note here that wherever a big town like Kannauj or Farrukhabad is mentioned the name of Mohalla should be given so as to give an idea on the respondent what he is supposed to meet.

6(A)(a)(vii).—This relates to printing and publishing two notices mentioned in annexures F. & G. and also distribution of these two notices at places given in schedule VI. A perusal of schedule VI goes to show that here also towns have been mentioned and "entire constituency at different places" was mentioned. This is vague and for reasons noted above by me specific places should be noted by the petitioner and amplification given thereby.

6(A)(a)(viii)(a).—This relates to distribution of pamphlets, leaflets, posters and calenders the details of which were given in schedule XVII and annexures of which were G, C, K, L, so far as the annexures are concerned it cannot be said to be vague but as regards distribution of these things of which instances were given in schedule XVIIA. I find that in schedule XVII distribution was said to be "In the constituency from 4th May 1963 to 7th May 1963 by the following persons". This is vague as specific places and dates of such distribution should be given in this schedule.

6(A)(a)(viii)(b).—In this para purchase of paper and printing of leaflets etc. was given. In this para specific quantity of paper, shop from which purchases were made and from where pamphlets were printed should be given to make the allegation specific and not vague.

6(A)(a)(viii)(c).—In this paragraph allegation about stencilling was made but no specific place was noted. This should be given namely the place or polling stations where this stencilling took place.

6(A)(a)(viii)(d).—This does not require any amplification as the name of the person in whose name the telephone connection was taken has been noted.

6(A)(a)(viii)(e).—This cannot be said to be vague and does not require further amplification.

6(A)(a)(viii)(f).—This relates to engagement of workers from out side. In this clause places from where the workers were imported, the expences incurred over these workers and the period of such expenses should be specifically noted.

6(A)(a)(viii)(g).—This relates to purchase of petrol. Here the name of the petrol shop from where this petrol is said to have been purchased should be given to put the respondent No. 1 in a position to meet it out.

6(A)(a)(viii)(h).—It does not require further amplification.

6(A)(a)(ix).—This relates to promises to pay Pradhan of Gram Samaj of a polling station. It also relates to intimidation of electors by the workers, supporters and agents of respondent No. 1 as well as by the Pradhan of Kanjhiana. The details were given in schedule VII. Schedule VII shows that although date is noted but place is not noted. Place should be mentioned. Then again the name of electors subjected to threat or intimidation should also be clearly given by the petitioner, as was observed by Their Lordships in the case of Chandra Shekhar Singh Vs. Sarju Pd. Singh and another reported in E.L.R. 1960 volume 22 page 206 at page 219. Here Their Lordships clearly observed that "u/s 123(2) it is provided that if any candidate or his agent threatens any elector with injury of any kind, he shall be deemed to have interfered with the free exercise of the electoral right. The particulars of corrupt practices necessarily include the names of the electors alleged to have been subjected to such corrupt practices.

6(A)(a)(x).—This relates to making gifts of calendars to the voters instances of which were given in schedule XV. Here only few names were given. The petitioner must give names of those voters to whom these calendars were given or he can confine his case to these few names alone. This amplification should be given by him. Moreover here as well specific dates and names of places should be given. This amplification in any case has got to be made in this schedule.

6(A)(a)(xi).—This relates to engagement of lady workers who influenced female voters of the constituency. The names of the lady workers and dates and places were given in schedule VIII. A perusal of this schedule goes to show that here also specific places have not been given. Only the names of towns are given. Amplifications should therefore be given showing specific places. I do not agree with the contention of respondent No. 1 that the names of female voters should be given because it is clearly mentioned in this para that female voters of the constituency were contacted in this behalf and polling lists of voters being available it cannot be said that any thing vague is left out because it would be a matter of evidence.

6(A)(a)(xii).—This paragraph relates to appeal by respondent No. 1 to Agrawal Vaish Community of Farrukhabad district. The details of meetings where this appeal was made are noted in schedule IX. The perusal of this schedule goes to show that here also only names of towns have been mentioned. Specific places of meetings should be noted here. I do not agree with the contention advanced from the side of the respondent No. 1 that the names of the voters to whom this appeal was made should be given because here it was mentioned that this appeal was made to Agrawal Vaish voters and consequently once again polling list being available it does not require any amplification but it is a matter purely concerned with evidence.

6(A)(a)(xiii).—This relates to promises made to the Govt. servants. In schedule X names of the Govt. servants and places where these persons worked have been given. I find from a perusal of this schedule that at serial No. 5 names of the head constables and constables were not given. Similarly the name of the villages also as against this are not noted. These details should be amplified.

6(A)(a)(xiv).—This relates to exercise of undue influence by sarpanches upon the voters. The details about this were given in schedule XVIII. A perusal of this schedule goes to show that although the names of sarpanches were given but names of the voters upon whom this undue influence was exercised were not given. For reasons given by me above the names of the voters upon whom this undue influence was exercised should be given and to this effect amplification is necessary on the part of the petitioner.

6(A)(a)(xv).—In this paragraph undue influence was said to have been exercised upon the electors by the workers, agents and supporters of respondent No. 1. No instance has been quoted I would therefore mention here that a schedule should be given giving the names of those workers who exercised undue influence, dates and places and the names of the voters upon whom this undue influence was exercised should also be given, to remove vagueness.

6(A)(a)(xvi).—It does not require any amplification.

6(A)(a)(xvii).—This relates to hiring and procuring of bullock-carts, Ekkas, Tongas and rickshaws for the conveyance of the electors to and from polling stations. The details were given in schedule XIII. Since corrupt practice on this scope is hiring or procuring a vehicle for conveyance of electors, it is essential that the names of the voters conveyed, places from where these were conveyed, the names of polling stations as well as clear identity of the names of the owners of these vehicles should be given. In this respect schedule XIII is lacking and consequently amplification on the lines indicated by me above should be given by the petitioner.

6(B)(i).—This relates to exercise of undue influence upon the voters relating to polling stations given in schedule XIII. In schedule XII the names of the polling stations are given but the names of the agents, workers and supporters who exercised undue influence as well as the names of the voters upon whom this undue influence was exercised are not given. This should be amplified in this schedule.

6(B)(ii).—This does not require any amplification.

6(B)(iii).—This does not require any amplification.

6(B)(iv).—This relates to appeal to Muslim community on this ground of religion and distribution of notices, pamphlets and meetings the details of which were given in schedule XIV. A perusal of this schedule goes to show that here also the names of towns have been given. Specific names of the places where the meetings were held should be given and to this extent amplification should be made in this schedule.

I give two weeks to petitioner to file the relevant amplifications detailed by me above. He should move suitable amendment application in this behalf giving amplifications as noted above.

(Sd.) S. K. KAUL,
Member,
Election Tribunal,
Farrukhabad.
4-1-64.

Signed, dated and pronounced in open court.

(Sd.) S. K. KAUL,
Member,
Election Tribunal,
Farrukhabad.
4-1-64.

[No. 82/5/62.]

By Order,
PRAKASH NARAIN, Secy,

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS*New Delhi, the 30th April 1965*

S.O. 1432.—The Central Government is pleased to notify that Raja Bahadur Shri Manvendra Singh Ju Dev and Maharajkumar Shri Lokendra Singh Ju Dev, sons of Maharaja of Panna, have been nominated by the said ruler for the purpose of entry 2(b) of Schedule I annexed to the Ministry of Home Affairs Notification No. 15/13/59(V)-P.IV, dated the 13th July, 1962 [G.S.R. No. 991 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii), dated the 28th July, 1962].

[No. 16/8/65-P.IV.]

G. L. BAILUR, Under Secy.

गृह मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली: 30 अप्रैल, 1965

एस० आ० सं० 1433.—केन्द्रीय सरकारको यह सूचित करने हुये हर्ष है कि पन्ना के महाराजा के पुत्र राजाबहादुर श्री मानवेन्द्र सिंह जू देव, और महाराजकुमार श्री लोकेन्द्र सिंह जू देव, उक्त शासक द्वारा गृह मंत्रालय की 13 जुलाई, 1962 की अधिसूचना संख्या 15/13/59 पं०-IV के साथ संलग्न अनुसूची की प्रविष्टि 2 (ख) [भारत के राजपत्र भाग II खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड(ii) दिनांक 28 जुलाई 1962 में प्रकाशित ज० एस० आर० 991 के लिये नामित किये गये हैं।]

[संख्या 16/8/65 पुलिस-IV.]

जी० एल० वेलूर

अवर सचिव, भारत सरकार।

MINISTRY OF FINANCE**(Department of Economic Affairs)***New Delhi, the 28th April, 1965.*

S.O. 1434.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Companies Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of section 9 of the said Act shall not apply to the Bari Doab Bank Ltd., Hoshiarpur in respect of the properties held by it at Premgarh, Hoshiarpur District, Punjab and at Kotwal, Ferozepur District, Punjab, till the 15th March 1966.

[No. F. 15(6)-BC/65.]

B. J. HEERJEE, Under Secy.

(Department of Economic Affairs)

New Delhi, the 29th April 1965

S.O. 1435.—Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, as on the 23rd April, 1965

BANKING DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
Capital Paid Up	5,00,00,000	Notes	31,23,81,000
		Rupee Coin	7,17,000
Reserve Fund	80,00,00,000	Small Coin	3,53,000
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	86,00,00,000	Bills purchased and discounted:—	
		(a) Internal
		(b) External
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	9,00,00,000	(c) Government Treasury Bills	85,17,34,000
		Balances held Abroad*	6,74,73,000
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	10,00,00,000	Investments**	133,04,90,000
		Loans and Advances to :—	
		(i) Central Government
		(ii) State Governments @	83,40,70,000

Deposits :—

		Loans and Advances to :—	
		(i) Scheduled Banks†	119,23,31,000
(a) Government:		(ii) State Co-operative Banks††	119,30,61,000
		(iii) Others	4,20,55,000
(i) Central Government	49,51,99,000	Loans, advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund—	
(ii) State Governments	16,40,30,000	(a) Loans and Advances to:—	
		(i) State Governments	29,87,83,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks	10,73,63,000
		(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks
(b) Banks:		(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	4,45,53,000
		Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund—	
(i) Scheduled Banks	93,98,86,000	Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	
(ii) State Co-operative Banks	3,95,24,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund—	
(iii) Other Banks	1,73,000	(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank	1,24,93,000
(c) Others	168,14,08,000	(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank
Bills Payable	68,94,01,000	Other Assets	46,89,78,000
Other Liabilities	84,72,14,000		
Rupees	675,68,35,000	Rupees	675,68,35,000

*Includes Cash and Short-term Securities.

**Excluding investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

@ Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

†Includes Rs. 47,68,50,000 advanced to scheduled banks against usance bills under section 17(4)(c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

††Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 23rd day of April, 1965

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department	31,23,81,000		Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
Notes in circulation	2712,70,26,000		(a) Held in India	133,75,66,000	
Total Notes issued		2743,94,07,000	(b) Held outside India	
			Foreign Securities	72,46,13,000	
			TOTAL		206,21,79,000
			Rupee Coin		96,57,13,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities		2441,15,15,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper
TOTAL LIABILITIES		2743,94,07,000	TOTAL ASSETS		2743,94,07,000

Dated the 28th day of April, 1965.

P. C. BHATTACHARYYA,
Governor.

[No. F. 3(2)-BC/65.]

New Delhi, the 30th April 1965

S.O. 1436.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 45 of the Banking Companies Act, 1949, the Central Government, after considering an application made by the Reserve Bank of India under sub-section (1) of that section, hereby makes an order of moratorium in respect of the Vettaikaranpudur Mahajana Bank Ltd., Vettaikaranpudur for the period from the close of business on the 1st May 1965 up to and inclusive of the 31st August 1965 and hereby stays the commencement or continuance of all actions and proceedings against that banking company during the period of moratorium, subject to the condition that such stay shall not in any manner prejudice the exercise by the Central Government of its powers under clause (b) of sub-section (4) of section 35 of the said Act or the exercise by the Reserve Bank of India of its powers under section 38 of the said Act.

2. The Central Government hereby also directs that, during the period of moratorium granted to it, the Vettaikaranpudur Mahajana Bank Ltd., Vettaikaranpudur, shall not, without the permission in writing of the Reserve Bank of India,

(a) grant any loan or advance, incur any liability, make any investment or agree to or disburse any payment, whether in discharge of its liabilities and obligations or otherwise, or enter into any compromise or arrangement, except to the extent and in the manner provided hereunder:—

- (i) a sum not exceeding 10 per cent of the total balance in every savings bank or current account or in any other deposit by whatever name called, provided that the sum total of the amounts paid in respect of the accounts standing in the name of any one person (and not jointly with that of any other person) does not exceed Rs. 250 and provided further that no amount shall be paid to any depositor who is indebted to the bank in any way;
- (ii) the amounts of any drafts or pay orders issued by the said bank and remaining unpaid on the date of which the order of moratorium comes into force;
- (iii) the amounts of the bills received for collection on or before the 1st May 1965 and realised before, on or after that date;
- (iv) any expenditure which has necessarily to be incurred in connection with any suits or appeals filed by or against or decrees obtained by the said bank or for realising any amounts due to it, provided that if the expenditure in respect of each such suit or appeal or decree or proceeding is in excess of Rs. 250 the permission in writing of the Reserve Bank of India shall be obtained before it is incurred; and
- (v) any expenditure or any other item in so far as it is in the opinion of the banking company necessary for carrying on the day-to-day administration of the banking company, provided that where the total expenditure on any item in any calendar month exceeds the average monthly expenditure on account of that item during the six calendar months preceding the order of moratorium, or if no expenditure has been incurred on account of that item in the past exceeds a sum of Rs. 250, the permission in writing of the Reserve Bank of India shall be obtained before the additional expenditure is incurred;

(b) sell, transfer or otherwise dispose of any of its immovable properties except in pursuance of any agreement entered into by it prior to the 2nd May 1965.

3. The Central Government hereby also directs that the Vettaikaranpudur Mahajana Bank Ltd., Vettaikaranpudur, may, during the period of the moratorium granted to it, make the following further payments, namely, the amounts necessary for repaying loans or advances granted against Government securities or other securities to the Vettaikaranpudur Mahajana Bank Ltd., Vettaikaranpudur, by the Reserve Bank of India or the State Bank of India or any of its subsidiaries or by any other bank and remaining unpaid on the date on which the order of moratorium comes into force.

4. The Central Government hereby further directs that during the period of moratorium, the Vettaikaranpudur Mahajana Bank Ltd., Vettaikaranpudur, shall be permitted to operate its accounts with the Reserve Bank of India or with

any other bank for the purposes of making the payments aforesaid, provided that nothing in this order shall be deemed to require the Reserve Bank of India or any other bank aforesaid to satisfy itself that the conditions imposed by this order are being observed before any amounts are released in favour of the Vettaikaranpudur Mahajana Bank Ltd., Vettaikaranpudur.

5. The Central Government hereby further directs that the Vettaikaranpudur Mahajana Bank Ltd., Vettaikaranpudur, may, during the period of moratorium, return any bills which have remained unrealised to the persons entitled to receive them on a request being made in this behalf by such persons, if the bank has no right or title to, or interest in, such bills.

6. The Central Government hereby also directs that the Vettaikaranpudur Mahajana Bank Ltd., Vettaikaranpudur, may release or deliver goods or securities which may be pledged, hypothecated or mortgaged or otherwise charged to it against any loan, cash credit or overdraft

- (i) in any case in which full payment towards all the amounts due from the borrower or borrowers, as the case may be, has been received by the bank, unconditionally; and
- (ii) in any other case, to such an extent as may be necessary or possible, without reducing the proportions of the margins on the said goods or securities below the stipulated proportions or the proportions which were maintained before the order of moratorium came into force, whichever may be higher.

[No. F. 17(7)-BC/65.]

R. K. SESHADRI.

Director (Banking).—

(Department of Company Affairs and Insurance)

INSURANCE

New Delhi, the 3rd May 1965

S.O. 1437.—Whereas the Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 52A of the Insurance Act, 1938 (4 of 1938), appointed Shri M. J. Rao, as Administrator to manage the affairs of the Jupiter General Insurance Company Limited with its registered office at Bombay in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Economic Affairs) No. 107(4)-INS/56, dated the 13th March, 1956.

And whereas the said Shri M. J. Rao has been granted leave with effect from 3rd May, 1965 to 10th July, 1965.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 52A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri C. C. Mody, General Manager, Jupiter General Insurance Co. Ltd., Bombay as Administrator to manage the affairs of the said insurer during the absence on leave of Shri M. J. Rao, under the direction and control of the Controller of Insurance and directs that the said Administrator shall receive such remuneration payable out of the funds of the Jupiter General Insurance Company Limited as may be fixed by the Government.

[No. F. 51(12)-INS.I/65.]

S.O. 1438.—Whereas the Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 52A of the Insurance Act, 1938 (4 of 1938), appointed Shri M. J. Rao, as Administrator to manage the affairs of the Empire of India Life Assurance Company Limited with its registered office at Bombay in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Economic Affairs) No. 107(4)-INS/56, dated the 13th March, 1956.

And whereas the said Shri M. J. Rao has been granted leave with effect from 3rd May 1965 to 10th July 1965.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 52A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri C. C. Mody, General Manager, Jupiter General Insurance Company Limited, Bombay as Administrator to manage the affairs of the Empire of India Life Assurance Company Ltd. during the absence on leave of Shri M. J. Rao, under the direction and control of the Controller of Insurance and directs that the said Administrator

shall receive such remuneration payable out of the funds of Empire of India Life Assurance Company Limited as may be fixed by the Government.

[No. F. 51(12)INS.I/65.]

S. S. SHARMA, Under Secy.

CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES

INCOME-TAX

New Delhi, the 1st May 1965

S.O. 1439.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 122 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and of all other powers enabling it in that behalf, the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following further amendments in the Schedule appended to its Notification S.O. 1619 (No. 26-Incometax, dated 7th May 1964) dated 16th May 1964, namely:—

In the said Schedule against Patna-B Range, Bhagalpur Range and Ranchi Range, under column 2, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

Patna-B

1. Special Investigation Circle, Patna.
2. Special Circle, Patna.
3. Salaries Circle, Patna.
4. Gaya Circle, Gaya.
5. Special Estate Duty-cum-Income-tax Circle, Patna.

Bhagalpur.

1. Bhagalpur Circle, Bhagalpur.
2. Santhal Pargana Circle, Deoghar.
3. Monghyr Circle, Monghyr.

Ranchi.

1. Ranchi Palamau Circle, Ranchi.
2. Ranchi Special Circle, Ranchi.
3. Ranchi Special Estate Duty-cum-Income-tax Circle, Ranchi.
4. Salaries Circle, Ranchi.
5. Palamau Circle, Daltonganj.
6. Ranchi Circle, Ranchi.
7. Hazaribagh Circle, Hazaribagh.

This notification shall take effect from 14th May, 1965.

Explanatory Note

The amendments have become necessary on account of re-organisation of the above ranges in the Commissioner's charge.

(The above note does not form a part of the notification but is intended to be merely clarificatory).

[No. 35 (F. No. 50/54/65-ITJ).]

T. N. PANDEY, Under Secy.

CENTRAL BOARD OF EXCISE & CUSTOMS

CUSTOMS

New Delhi, the 8th May 1965

S.O. 1440.—In pursuance of clause (d) of section 152 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962), read with notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue and Company Law) No. 41/F. No. 21/10/62-Cus.IV, dated the 21st March, 1964, the Central Board of Excise and Customs hereby empowers the Preventive Inspectors of Customs at Marmagaoa Custom House to exercise the powers of an Assistant Collector of Customs to sanction drawback in respect of personal effects of passengers to the extent specified in the said notification.

[No. 57/F. No. 21/10/62-Cus.IV(Pt.).]

M. PANCHAPPA, Secy.

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE*New Delhi, the 27th April 1965*

S.O. 1441.—Whereas the Central Government is satisfied that control of inter-state trade and commerce in Eau-de-Cologne is necessary in the public interest;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 4 of the Spirituous Preparations (Inter-State Trade and Commerce) Control Act, 1955 (39 of 1955), the Central Government hereby declares Eau-de-Cologne to be a spirituous preparation within the meaning of that Act.

[No. F. 27(3)-Com(Genl)/63.]

New Delhi, the 29th April 1965

S.O. 1442.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 13 of the Spirituous Preparations (Inter-State Trade and Commerce) Control Act, 1955 (39 of 1955), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Commerce and Industry S.R.O. 2777-A, dated the 30th August 1957, namely:—

In the said Notification, for item 2, the following item shall be substituted, namely:—

- “2. Other medicinal preparations containing alcohol falling under clauses (a) and (b) of entry (i) in column 2 against item No. 1 and under entry (i) in column 2 against item No. 2 in the Schedule to the Medicinal and Toilet Preparations (Excise Duties) Act, 1955 as amended by the Finance Act, 1964”.

[No. F. 27(5)-Com(Genl)/64.]

M. L. GUPTA, Under Secy.

**(Import Trade Control)
ORDER**

New Delhi, the 29th April, 1965.

S.O. 1443/IECA/3-4A/3/64.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sections 3 and 4A of the Imports and Exports (Control) Act, 1947 (18 of 1947), the Central Government hereby makes the following Order further to amend the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, namely:—

1. This Order may be called the Imports (Control) Second Amendment Order, 1965.

2. In the Imports (Control) Order, 1955—

- (i) in sub-clause (2) of clause 10B, the words, figures and letters “subject to the provisions of clause 10C” shall be inserted at the beginning;
- (ii) after clause 10B, as so amended, the following clause shall be inserted, namely:—

“10C. Power to make directions for the sale of imported goods in certain cases.

(1) Where, on the importation of any goods or at any time thereafter, the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports is satisfied, after giving a reasonable opportunity to the licensee of being heard in the matter, that such goods cannot be utilised for the purpose for which they were imported he may, by order, direct the licensee or any other person having possession or control of such goods to sell such goods to such person, within such time, and at such price, as may be specified in the direction.

(2) The price that may be specified under sub-clause (1) shall be the aggregate of the landed cost of the goods, clearing transportation charges and such other incidental charges incurred in relation thereto as are considered reasonable in the circumstances of the case by the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports.

(3) The licensee or the person to whom any direction has been made under sub-clause (1) shall be bound to comply with such direction.”.

[No. 4/65.]

P. SABANAYAGAM,
Chief Controller of Imports and Exports.

MINISTRY OF STEEL AND MINES**(Department of Mines and Metals)****ERRATA***New Delhi, the 26th April 1965*

S.O. 1444.—In the Schedule to the notification of the Government of India, Ministry of Steel and Mines, Department of Mines and Metals, No. S.O. 379-B, dated the 22nd January, 1965, published at pages 77B-77C of the Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part II, Section 3(ii), dated the 30th January, 1965,—

1. under the heading "Deshergarh Block 'B'", against serial No. 7, for "Anandpur" read "Anandapur"; and

2. under the heading "Boundary description"—

(a) in the third paragraph, for "Anandpur" read "Anandapur";

(b) in the fourth paragraph—

(i) for "Anandpur, Ishwarda, Rajpur" read "Anandapur, Ishwarda, Rajpura";

(ii) for "Balrampur" read "Balarampur".

[No. C2-24(1)/61.]

S.O. 1445.—In the Schedule to the notification of the Government of India, Ministry of Steel and Mines, Department of Mines and Metals, No. S.O. 379-C, dated the 22nd January, 1965, published at pages 77C-77D of the Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part II, Section 3(ii), dated the 30th January, 1965,—

(a) under the heading "Deshergarh Block 'C'"—

(i) against serial No. 9, for "Inaganpur" read "Inganpur";

(ii) against serial No. 25, in the column under the heading "Remarks" for "Full", read "Part";

(iii) against serial No. 28, under the heading "Remarks" insert "Full";

(iv) against serial No. 29, under the heading "Remarks", for "Part" read "Full"; and

(b) under the heading "Boundary description", in paragraph 5, for "Pardiha" read "Paradiha".

[C2-24(1)/61.]

S.O. 1446.—In the Schedule to the notification of the Government of India, Ministry of Steel and Mines, Department of Mines and Metals, No. S.O. 379-A, dated the 22nd January, 1965, published at pages 77A-77B of Part II, Section 3(ii), of the Gazette of India, Extraordinary, dated the 30th January, 1965,—

(a) under the heading "Deshergarh Block 'A'"—

(i) against serial No. 1, for "Marsamuda" read "Narsamuda",

(ii) against serial No. 17—for "Kutilapur 58....." read "Kullapur 58"; and

(b) under the heading "Boundary description", in the second paragraph, for "Aluthive" read "Aluthiye".

[No. C2-24(1)/61.]

K. SUBRAHMANYAN, Under Secy,

MINISTRY OF FOOD & AGRICULTURE**(Department of Agriculture)***New Delhi, the 27th April 1965*

S.O. 1447.—In pursuance of clause (f) of section 3 of the Agricultural Produce (Grading and Marking) Act, 1937 (1 of 1937), and clauses (i) and (k) of rule 4 of the General Grading and Marking Rules, 1937, the Central Government hereby fixes with effect from the date of publication of this notification,

the charges for Agmark labels to be affixed to packages of Chilli powder, Turmeric powder and Coriander powder at 2 paise (two paise only) for every such package of 10 kilograms.

[No. F. 17-30/64-A.M.]

S.O. 1448.—In pursuance of clause (f) of section 3 of the Agricultural Produce (Grading and Marking) Act, 1937 (1 of 1937) and clauses (i) and (k) of rule 4 of the General Grading and Marking Rules, 1937, and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Department of Agriculture) No. S.O. 3607, dated the 22nd November, 1962, the Central Government hereby fixes, with effect from the date of publication of this notification, the charges for Agmark labels to be affixed on the containers of Chillies at Rs. 0.15 Paise per pack of 25 Kg. or part thereof.

[No. F. 17-7/64-AM.]

S.O. 1449.—In pursuance of clause (f) of section 3 of the Agricultural Produce (Grading and Marking) Act, 1937 (1 of 1937) and clauses (i) and (k) of rule 4 of the General Grading and Marking Rules, 1937, and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Department of Agriculture) No. S.O. 3606, dated the 22nd November, 1962, the Central Government hereby fixes, with effect from the date of publication of this notification, the undermentioned charges for Agmark labels to be affixed on the containers of Black Pepper, namely:—

(i) Rs. 0.14 Paise per pack of 77 Kg. or part thereof.

(ii) Rs. 0.02 Paise for every additional weight of 5 Kg. or part thereof in excess of 77 Kg.

[No. F. 17-7/64-AM.]

S.O. 1450.—In pursuance of clause (f) of section 3 of the Agricultural Produce (Grading and Marking) Act, 1937 (1 of 1937) and clauses (i) and (k) of rule 4 of the General Grading and Marking Rules, 1937 and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Department of Agriculture) No. S.O. 3605 dated the 22nd November, 1962, the Central Government hereby fixes, with effect from the date of publication of this notification, the undermentioned charges for Agmark labels to be affixed on the containers of cardamoms, graded under Agmark, namely:—

(i) Rs. 0.15 Paise per pack upto 13 Kg. (nett).

(ii) Rs. 0.30 Paise per pack above 13 Kg. and upto 26 Kg. (nett).

(iii) Rs. 0.62 Paise per pack above 26 Kg. and upto 51 Kg. (nett).

[No. F. 17-7/64-A.M.]

New Delhi, the 1st May 1965

S.O. 1451.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the Agricultural Produce (Grading and Marketing) Act, 1937 (1 of 1937), the Central Government hereby declares that the provisions of the said Act shall apply to the following articles, namely:—

1. Gram (*Cicer arietinum*).
2. Jowar (*Sorghum vulgare*).
3. Maize (*Zea mays*).
4. Barley (*Hordeum vulgare*).
5. Ragi (*Eleusio coracana*).
6. Bajra (*Pennisetum typhoides*).

[No. F. 17-28/64-AM.]

New Delhi, the 3rd May 1965

S.O. 1452.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (2) of rule 11, clause (b) of sub-rule (2) of rule 14 and sub-rule (I) of rule 23 of the Central Civil Service (Classification Control and Appeal) Rules, 1957, the President hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government

of India in the late Ministry of Agriculture No. S.R.O. 634-A dated the 28th February, 1957, namely:—

In the Schedule to the said notification,—

- (i) In Part I—General Central Service, Class III, under the sub-heading “Directorate of Marketing and Inspection” for the entries in columns 2, 3, 4, and 5 against the entry “All posts” in column 1, the following entries shall respectively be substituted, namely:—

2	3	4	5
“Deputy Agricultural Marketing Adviser	Deputy Agricultural Marketing Adviser	All	Agricultural Marketing Adviser”

[No. F. 2-10/65-AM.]

SANTOKH SINGH, Under Secy.

(Department of Agriculture)

New Delhi, the 27th April 1965

S.O. 1453.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 5 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955 (10 of 1955) and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Department of Agriculture) No. S.O. 526 dated the 3rd February, 1964, the Central Government hereby directs that the powers conferred on it by section 3 of the said Act to make orders providing for the matters specified in clauses (a), (d), (e), (f), (h), (i) and (j) of sub-section (2) of that section shall, in relation to cotton, be exercisable, also by the Government of the State of Punjab within that State.

[No. 1-11/63-Econ.Py.]

A. C. JAIN, Under Secy.

(Department of Agriculture)
Indian Council of Agricultural Research

New Delhi, the 23rd April, 1965.

S.O. 1454—In pursuance of the provisions of Rules 22(4) of the Indian Central Coconut Committee Rules, 1945, the Central Government hereby publish the following accounts of the receipts and expenditure of the Indian Central Coconut Committee and audit report thereon for the financial year ending 31st March, 1964.

Receipts and Payments Account of the Indian Central Coconut Committee for the Financial Year ended 31st March, 1964

PART I (Regular)

Receipts				Payments			
		Rs.	Rs.			Rs.	Rs.
To Opening Balance		15,09,295		<i>Administration</i>			
To Advances recoverable		1,34,901					
			16,44,196				
Cess Collections on copra			8,29,133	<i>Revenue Expenditure</i>			
<i>Other Receipts.</i>				Pay of officers		20,424	
<i>Receipts from publications</i>				Pay of staff		65,889	
1. Subscription to Bulletin		3,156		D.A.		12,110	
2. Subscription to Journal		460		House Rent Allowance		1,898	
3. Cost of Handbook		692		Medical Attendance Fees		1,385	
4. Sale of Monograph		1,677		T.A.		9,290	
5. Postage on publications		254		Children's Educational Allowance		2,155	
6. Advertisement in Bulletin		1,888		L.S. & P. Contribution		5,118	
			7,427	I.C. Coc. C. P.F. Contribution		4,974	
Miscellaneous Receipts			14,149	P.C. & R.		654	
Conveyance advance recovery			684	Postage, telegrams and telephone		6,817	
				Stationery and Forms		3,791	
<i>Central Coconut Research Station, Kasaragod</i>				Printing		5,257	
1. Farm Produce		85,329		Books and Periodicals		1,616	
2. Rent		1,963		Office Contingencies		13,681	
3. Miscellaneous receipts		2,480		Audit Fees		1,320	
4. Van and cart hire charges		79		Conveyance Advance		175	
5. Conveyance advance recovery		215					1,56,554
			90,066				

Receipts from the scheme for procurement and supply
of seed coconuts to States

Central Coconut Research Station, Kayangulam

1. Farm Produce	30,892
2. Rent	1,627
3. Conveyance advance recovery	40
4. Miscellaneous receipts	3,611
	<hr/>

Advance payable

Indian Central Coconut Committee Provident
Fund Subscription of Smt. Malathy and Dr. Ninan

Capital Expenditure

200	Buildings—Residential & Non-Residential	1,030	
	Furniture & Office equipment	570	
		<hr/>	1,600
	T.A. of non-official members		6,046

Publicity and Propaganda

	Bulletin	22,436	
	Journal	2,569	
	Photographic Materials	166	
		<hr/>	25,171
			1,64,200

36,170

320	Pamphlets	2,804	
	Exhibition	766	
	Miscellaneous	1,279	
	Advertisement	730	
		<hr/>	30,750

Central Coconut Research Station, Kasaragod.

Revenue Expenditure

	Pay of officers	28,077	
	Pay of staff	62,785	
	D.A.	8,570	
	Medical Attendance Fees	90	
	T.A.	7,821	
	Children's Educational Allowance	1,810	
	L.S. & P. contribution	1,366	
	I.C. Coc. C.P.F. contribution	5,768	
	P.C. & R.	2,759	
	Cultivation Charges	11,433	
	Manures & Chemicals	9,152	
	Maintenance of Cattle	5,543	
	Miscellaneous Expenses	29,282	
	Apparatus and Materials	9,917	
	Books and Periodicals	2,516	
	Office Contingencies	16,432	
	Photographic Materials	294	
	Conveyance advance	320	
		<hr/>	2,03,935

Receipts	Payments	Rs.	Rs.
Rs.			
	<i>Scheme for procurement and supply of Seed Coconuts to States</i>		
	Pay of staff	9,188	
	D.A.	1,612	
	T.A.	3,985	
	Children's Educational Allowance	605	
	I.C. Coc. C. P.F. Contribution	560	
	Packing & Transport	13,614	
	Railway freight	69,042	
	Cost of Gunny bags	14,955	
	Cost of Nuts	1,57,295	
	Harvesting and collection	7,555	
	Miscellaneous	3,286	
			2,81,697
	<i>Harmonie Spraying Scheme</i>		
	Pay of staff	3,266	
	D.A.	461	
	T.A.	132	
	Children's Educational Allowance	400	
	I.C. Coc. C. P.F. Contribution	313	
	Apparatus & Materials	69	
	Miscellaneous	2,477	
			7,118
	<i>Capital Expenditure</i>		
	Lay out	5,413	
	Buildings—Residential & Non-Residential.	6,653	
	Farm Implements, Carts & Vans	399	
	Furniture & office equipment	1,694	
	Laboratory equipment	1,121	
	Meteorological observatory	364	
			15,644

Central Coconut Research Station, Kayangulam

Revenue Expenditure

Pay of Officers	27,593	
Pay of staff	71,394	
D.A.	9,371	
Medical attendance fees	476	
T.A.	8,591	
Children's Educational Allowance	1,470	
L.S. & P. Contribution	471	
I.C. Coc. C. P. F. Contribution	5,911	
P. C. R.	1,330	
Cultivation Charges	10,974	
Manures & Chemicals	15,123	
Miscellaneous Expenses	37,459	
Apparatus & Materials	10,336	
Books & Periodicals	3,425	
Office Contingencies	9,257	
Photographic Materials	314	2,13,495

Capital Expenditure

Lay out	614	
Buildings—Residential and Non-Residential	641	
Farm Implements, Carts & Vans	841	
Furniture & Office Equipment	1,827	
Laboratory Equipment	9,248	
Meteorological observatory	325	13,496
Coconut Fertiliser Demonstration Scheme		1,243

Grants-in-aid Schemes Miscellaneous

1. Scheme for maintenance of representative varieties of coconuts in Assam	1,209	
2. Scheme for laying out simple manurial trials in coconut cultivators' gardens		
(i) Madras	1,300	
(ii) Maharashtra	1,600	
(iii) Mysore	2,400	6,509

Receipts		Payments	
	Rs.		Rs.
		Refund of unspent balance of Central Grant (unspent balance of Second Five Year Plan grant received from the C.F.T.R.I., Mysore).	7,212
		Committed Schemes transfer	2,62,977
		Central Coconut Research Station Kasaragod	
		Suspense Account	117
		<i>Advances recoverable</i>	
		Advance for P. D. account—	
		Kayangulam and Kasaragod	18,000
		Caution Money Deposit	50
		Festival advance	1,630
		Office—Contingent advance	250
		Advance for P. D. account of the Assistants, Badagara & Trichur	12,500
		Advance pay to Shri P. V. Kunjan	45
		Advance drawn by the Assistant, Seednut Procurement Scheme, Badagara from his P.D. account	207
		Advance Pay to Shri M. V. George	120
		Imprest—office of the I.C. Coc. C.	750
		Do. C.C.S.R.S., Kayangulam	1,500
		Do. C.C.R.S, Kasaragood	1,500
			36,552
		<i>Closing Balance</i>	
		Balance as per cash book	13,77,400
Total	26,22,345	Total	26,22,345
<i>Reconciliation Statement as on 31-3-1964</i>			
Balance in the P.D. account of:—			
1. Secretary, I.C.Coc. C., Ernakulam	17,24,413	Balance as per cash book	13,77,400
2. Director, C.C.R.S., Kasaragod	14,813	Cheque issued but not encashed (office)	3,09,657
3. Director, C.C.R.S., Kayangulam	12,405	Cheque issued but not encashed (Badagara)	7,575
4. Assistant, S.P.S., Badagara	7,815	Balance as per P.L. 480 cash book	42,249
5. Assistant, S.P.S., Trichur	2,022	Balance as per III Plan cash book	24,624
Add the amount remitted on 20-3-1964 but not taken into account in the Treasury Accounts	37		
Total	17,61,505	Total	17,61,505

Receipts and Payments Account of the Indian Central Coconut Committee for the Financial Year ended 31st March, 1964
PART I (Committed)

Receipts		Payments		
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Transfer from Part I Regular		2,62,977	<i>Administration</i>	
<i>Office of the Indian Central Coconut Committee</i>			Pay of staff	22,141
Conveyance Advance recovery	365		D.A.	3,280
<i>Central Coconut Research Station, Kasaragod</i>			H.R.A.	899
Conveyance Advance recovery	641		T.A.	851
			Medical Attendance Fees	605
			Children's Educational Allowance	630
			I.C. Coc. C. P.F. contribution	1,440
				<u>29,846</u>
			<i>Compilation and Analysis of Data</i>	
			Pay of officer	4,795
			Pay of staff	8,529
			D.A.	1,648
			H.R.A.	315
			T.A.	485
			L.S. & P. Contribution	11
			I.C. Coc. C. P.F. contribution	991
				<u>16,774</u>
			<i>Central Coconut Research Station, Kasaragod</i>	
			Pay of staff	61,477
			D.A.	8,181
			Medical Attendance Fees	210
			T.A.	2,685
			Children's Educational Allowance	720
			I.C. Coc. C. P.F. contribution	3,485
			Apparatus & Materials	108
			Books and Periodicals	70
			Office Contingencies	825
			Conveyance advance	170
				<u>77,931</u>

Receipts

Payments

	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.
			<i>Central Coconut Research Station, Kayangulam</i>		
			Pay of officers	11,275	
			Pay of staff	59,975	
			D.A.	9,245	
			T.A.	1,351	
			Children's Educational Allowance	760	
			I.C. Coc. C. P.F. Contribution	4,773	
			Miscellaneous Expenses	625	
					88,004
			<i>Grant-in-aid Schemes</i>		
			Regional Coconut Research Station, Madras	18,368	
			<i>Miscellaneous Schemes</i>		
			1. Scheme for the control of Anabe Roga of coconut in Mysore	7,160	
			2. Disease Investigation Scheme in Andhra Pradesh	25,900	
					51,428
Total		2,63,983	Total		2,63,983

PART II (Third Five Year Plan)

Receipts		Payments	
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs. Rs.
To opening balance		9,051	
To Contribution from Central Government towards Grant	3,00,000		
		<i>Central Coconut Research Station, Kasaragod</i>	
		<i>Revenue Expenditure</i>	
		Pay of staff	1,109
		D.A.	254
		T.A.	19
		I.C. Coc. C. P.F. Contribution	148
		Office contingencies	341
			1,871
		<i>Capital Expenditure</i>	
		Lay out	39,082
		Farm Implements, Carts and Vans	126
			39,208
		<i>Central Coconut Research Station, Kayangulam</i>	
		<i>Revenue Expenditure</i>	
		Pay of staff	2,160
		D.A.	380
		T.A.	29
		I.C. Coc. C. P.F. Contribution	142
		Cultivation charges	81
		Manures and Chemicals	773
		Miscellaneous Expenses	2,662
		Office contingencies	1,203
		Apparatus & Materials	980
			9,146
		<i>Capital Expenditure</i>	
		Farm Implements, Carts and Vans	3,254
		Laboratory equipment	3,951
			7,205
		<i>Grant-in-aid Schemes</i>	
		I. R.C.R.S., Mysore	47,200
		II. Pilot schemes for the correct estimation of area and yield of coconuts and arecanuts	

1. Kerala	25,036	
2. Madras	16,000	
3. Mysore	28,590	
4. Assam	31,786	
5. Maharashtra	17,770	
6. Andhra Pradesh	16,000	
7. Orissa	
8. West Bengal	27,264	
					<u>1,52,446</u>	

Miscellaneous Schemes.

Scheme of Research on artificial culturing of cocoanut embryos in Kerala State	8,300	
Refund of unspent balance of Central Grant received during the year 1962-63		9,051
Closing Balance		<u>24,624</u>
TOTAL	3,09,051	TOTAL 3,09,051

Receipts and Payments Account of the Indian Central Coconut Committee for the financial year ended 31st March, 1964.

P.L. 480 Scheme

Receipts		Payments	
	Rs.		Rs.
Amount received from the American Embassy, New Delhi.	92,041	<i>Capital Expenditure</i>	
		Equipments	27,573
		<i>Revenue Expenditure</i>	
		Pay of officers	3,974
		Pay of staff	4,830
		D.A.	939
		<i>Other Establishment Charges</i>	
		Stationery and Forms	13
		Children's Educational Allowance	120
		I.C.Coc. C. P.F. Contribution	1,595
		T.A.	1,154
		Other contractual services	17
		Supplies and Materials	8,222
		Overhead charges	1,355
			22,219
		Closing balance	42,249
Total .	92,041	Total .	92,041

Sd/-
Assistant,
I.C.Coc.C., Ernakulam.

Sd/- P. J. GREGORY,
Secretary,
I.C.Coc.C., Ernakulam.

CERTIFICATE

I have examined the foregoing Accounts of the Indian Central Coconut Committee, Ernakulam and obtained all the information and explanations that I have required and subject to the observations and the Audit Report appended, I certify, as a result of my audit that in my opinion these accounts are properly drawn up so as to exhibit a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the Committee according to the best of my information and explanations given to me and as shown by the books of the Committee.

Trivandrum.
16-1-1965.

Sd/- T.N. KURIAKOS,
Accountant General, Kerala.

Audit Report on the Accounts of the Indian Central Coconut Committee for the year 1963-64.

The main source of income of the Committee is the amount it receives from the Government of India, as the net proceeds of the cess levied under Section(3) of the Indian Coconut Committee Act, 1944. A sum of Rs. 8.29 lakhs was received by the Committee from this source during 1963-64. The Committee also received grants amounting to Rs. 3 lakhs from Government of India for the Coconut Research Schemes under the Third Five Year Plan and Rs. 0.92 lakh from the American Embassy, New Delhi under P.L. 480 Schemes.

2. The Schemes undertaken by the Committee include the running of two Research Stations, in Kerala State and a scheme for the procurement and supply of seed coconuts to State Governments. In addition, grants-in-aid are given to institutions and State Governments for schemes sponsored by them. The schemes undertaken by Government departments include the running of Regional Research Stations, schemes for investigation and control of coconut diseases, pilot scheme for the correct estimation of area and yield of coconuts etc.

A broad analysis of the receipts and payments of the Committee for the four years ending 1963-64 is given below:—

<i>Receipts</i>					<i>Payments.</i>				
Particulars.	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	Particulars	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64
	(Rupees in lakhs)					(Rupees in lakhs)			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Opening Balance.	10.71	11.91	11.93	15.18	Administrative Expenditure. .	1.55	1.76	1.83	1.94
Advances recoverable	0.74	1.01	1.31	1.35	<i>Research and other Schemes.</i>				
Amount transferred to the Com- mittee by the Govt. of India representing the proceeds of coconut cess	6.46	10.29	11.78	8.29	1. Schemes undertaken by the Committee.	8.48	8.89	9.27	10.25
Grant from Govt. of India . .	7.64	3.21	3.30	3.00	2. Grants-in-aid given to:—				
Other Receipts.	2.25	2.58	2.58	2.41	(a) Departments of State] Governments.	4.08	2.76	2.56	2.68
					(b) Non-Govt. Institutions including those sponsored by State Governments. . . .	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.08
					Other Miscellaneous Expendi- ture.	0.70	0.61	0.33	0.31
					Refund of balance of Grant received from Govt. of India	..	1.69	0.33	0.16
					Advances recoverable. . . .	1.01	1.31	1.35	0.37
					Closing Balance.	11.91	11.93	15.18	14.44
Total	27.80	29.00	30.90	30.23	Total	27.80	29.00	30.90	30.23

3. The proper utilisation of grants-in-aid paid by the Committee is watched through:—

(a) audit certificates from the Accountants General in respect of Government departments and other bodies, the audit of which has been entrusted to them and from professional auditors in other cases, regarding the utilisation of the grants-in-aid, and

(b) grant-in-aid statements from State Government departments showing the sums allotted, actual expenditure incurred, outstanding liabilities and unspent balance.

It was observed that these audit certificates and grant-in-aid statements covering amounts of Rs. 6.90 lakhs and Rs. 5.97 lakhs respectively were due to the Committee (December 1964) in respect of grants-in-aid paid by it from 1957-58 to 1963-64 as shown in the Statements below:—

1. Audit certificates yet to be received

Name of State	1957-58	1958-59	1959-60	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	Remarks
			(Rupees in Lakhs)					
Andhra Pradesh	0.40	0.54	0.33	0.48	0.42	In respect of Schemes undertaken by the State Governments, the issue of Audit Certificates is pending mainly due to the delay on the part of the Govt. departments in furnishing statements of expenditure and other relevant information to the respective Accountants General.
Assam	..	0.09	0.14	0.09	0.32	
Kerala	..	0.09	0.63	0.50	0.08	
Maharashtra	0.07	0.13	..	0.18	0.02	
Orissa	0.27	0.16	0.19	0.10	0.09	
West Bengal	..	0.03	0.02	0.01	..	0.18	0.27	
Madras	0.12	0.17	
Mysore	0.78	

2. Grant-in-aid statements still to be obtained from Government Departments.

Name of State.	Regional Research	Coconut Station.	Coconut Nurseries	Miscellaneous Schemes
	Year	Amount	Year	Amount
		(Rupees in Lakhs)		
Kerala	1960-61	0.12	1958-59-1960-61	1.09 1960-61 and 1963-64
Andhra Pradesh	1958-59-1960-61	0.24	1959-60-1960-61	0.23 1959-60-1963-64
Maharashtra	1959-60-1960-61	0.20	Nil	.. 1962-63 - 1963-64
West Bengal 1963-64
Madras	1962-63	0.11 1959-60-1960-61 & 1962-63 1963-64
Mysore	1963-64	0.47 1962-63-1963-64

Effective steps are called for to ensure that the Audit Certificates and grants-in-aid statements are received promptly.

Sd/- T.N. KURIAKOS,
Accountant General, Kerala.

[No. 7(100)/65—Com. I.]

J. S. UPPAL, Under Secy.

(Department of Agriculture)
(Indian Council of Agricultural Research)

New Delhi, the 27th April 1965

S.O. 1453.—In pursuance of Sub-Sections (h), (i), (k), (l), (m) and (r) of Section 4 of the Indian Oilseeds Committee Act 1946 (9 of 1946), the Central Government hereby appoint the following persons as members of the Indian Central Oilseeds Committee, to represent the interests shown against each, for the period ending the 30th September, 1965 or till the re-organisation of the Committee, whichever is earlier:

S. No.	Name of person	Sub-Section of section 4 of the Indian Oils Seeds Committee Act and interest represented
1.	Shri Subramaniya Gounder, M.L.A., President, Co-operative Marketing Society, Tiruchengode, Salem Dist., Madras.	(h) representing Co-operative movement.
2.	Shrimati Pratima Bose, Chairman, West Bengal Khadi & Village Industries Board, 14 Princep Street, Calcutta-13.	(j) representing village oilseeds crushing industry.
3.	Shri Sirasappa Ijari, M.L.A., Member of Khadi Board, Harpanahalli, Bellary District.	Do-
4.	Swami Ramanand Tirth, Vice-Chairman, Maharashtra State Khadi & Village Industries Board, Seva Niketan, Begumpet, Hyderabad.	Do-
5.	Dr. A. C. Chhatrapati, C/o The Vanaspati Manufacturers' Association of India, 5th Floor, India House, Fort St., Bombay.	(k) representing the vanaspati industry.
6.	Shri C. V. Mariwala, 281-87, Narshinatha Street, Bombay.	(l) representing power oilseed crushing industry.
7.	Shri Ramdas Kilachand, 45-47, Appolo Street, Bombay.	(m) representing exporters of oilseeds and oilseeds products.
8.	Shri E. R. Mahajani, Lakshmi Oil Mills, Akola.	(r) representing oilseeds trade associations.
9.	Shri Tokarshilalji Kapadia, Andhra Pradesh Grain & Seeds Merchants' Association, Hyderabad.	Do-
10.	Shri Vishan Swarup Aggarwal, 29-A, Sir Hari Ram Goenka Street, Calcutta.	Do-
11.	Shri Devji Rattansey, 23 Chinch Bunder, Bombay.	Do-

[No. 8-12/65-Com.III.]

S.O. 1456.—Under Section 4(x) of the Indian Cotton Cess Act, 1923 (14 of 1923), the Central Government are pleased to nominate the following persons to be members of the Indian Central Cotton Committee, Bombay, upto the 30th September, 1965, or upto the finalisation of the re-organisation proposals of the Committee, whichever is earlier:

1. Shri Iqbal Singh, M.P., Abohar, District Ferozepur.
2. Shri P. S. Patil, M.P., Chikhli, District Buldana.

[No. 1-3/65-Com.III.]

N. K. DUTTA, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF HEALTH

New Delhi, the 26th April 1965

S.O. 1457.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (p) of sub-section (1) of section 6 of the Indian Ports Act, 1908 (15 of 1908), the following rules, which the Central Government proposes to make further to amend the Indian Port Health Rules, 1955, published with the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Health No. S.R.O. 587 dated the 27th February, 1956, are hereby published, as required by sub-section (2) of section 6 of the said Act, for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby and notice is hereby given that the said rules will be taken into consideration on or after 26th July 1965.

2. Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person in respect of the said rules *before* the date specified will be considered by the Central Government.

Draft Amendment

1. These Rules may be called the Indian Port Health (Amendment) Rules, 1965.

2. In the Indian Port Health Rules, 1955, in sub-rule (2) of rule 57, in clause (ii) of the Note, for the words "and Visakhapatnam", the words "Visakhapatnam and Mandapam Camp/Dhanushkodli" shall be substituted.

[No. F. 33-1/64-IH.]

New Delhi, the 27th April 1965

S.O. 1458.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sections 12 and 33 of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 (23 of 1940), the Central Government, hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945, the same having been previously published as required by the said sections, namely:—

1. These rules may be called the Drugs and Cosmetics (Second Amendment) Rules, 1965.

2. In the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945, in Schedule "A":—

(1) In Form 10, after paragraph (2), the following paragraph shall be inserted, namely:—

"(3) The licensee shall inform the Licensing Authority in writing in the event of any change in the constitution of the firm operating under the licence. Where any change in the constitution of the firm takes place, the current licence shall be deemed to be valid for a maximum period of three months from the date on which the change takes place unless, in the meantime, a fresh licence has been taken from the Licensing Authority in the name of the firm with the changed constitution".

(2) In Forms 20 and 21A, under the heading 'Conditions of Licence' after item 4, the following item shall be inserted, namely:—

"(5) The licensee shall inform the Licensing Authority in writing in the event of any change in the constitution of the firm operating under the licence. Where any change in the constitution of the firm takes place, the current licence shall be deemed to be valid for a maximum period of three months from the date on which the change takes place unless, in the meantime, a fresh licence has been taken from the Licensing Authority in the name of the firm with the changed constitution."

(5) In Forms, 21-B and 25-B, under the heading 'Conditions of Licence', after item 5, the following item shall be inserted at the end, namely:—

"(6) The licensee shall inform the Licensing Authority in writing in the event of any change in the constitution of the firm operating under the licence. Where any change in the constitution of the firm takes place, the current licence shall be deemed to be valid for a maximum period of three months from the date on which the change takes place unless, in the meantime, a fresh licence has

been taken from the Licensing Authority in the name of the firm with the changed constitution".

(3) In Forms 20-A, under the heading "Conditions of Licence", after item 3, the following item shall be inserted, namely:—

"(4) The licensee shall inform the Licensing Authority in writing in the event of any change in the constitution of the firm operating under the licence. Where any change in the constitution of the firm takes place, the current licence shall be deemed to be valid for a maximum period of three months from the date on which the change takes place unless, in the meantime, a fresh licence has been taken from the Licensing Authority in the name of the firm with the changed constitution."

(4) In Form 21, under the heading 'Conditions of Licence', after item 5, the following item shall be inserted, namely:—

"(6) The licensee shall inform the Licensing Authority in writing in the event of any change in the constitution of the firm operating under the licence. Where any change in the constitution of the firm takes place, the current licence shall be deemed to be valid for a maximum period of three months from the date on which the change takes place unless, in the meantime, a fresh licence has been taken from the Licensing Authority in the name of the firm with the changed constitution."

(6) In Forms 20-B, 25, 25-A and 28 under the heading 'Conditions of Licence', after item 4, the following item shall be inserted, namely:—

"(5) The licensee shall inform the Licensing Authority in writing in the event of any change in the constitution of the firm operating under the licence. Where any change in the constitution of firm takes place, the current licence shall be deemed to be valid for a maximum period of three months from the date on which the change takes place unless, in the meantime, a fresh licence has been taken from the Licensing Authority in the name of the firm with the changed constitution."

(7) In Form 28-A, under the heading 'Conditions of Licence,' after item 3, the following item shall be inserted, namely:—

"(4) The licensee shall inform the Licensing Authority in writing in the event of any change in the constitution of the firm operating under the licence. Where any change in the constitution of the firm takes place, the current licence shall be deemed to be valid for a maximum period of three months from the date on which the change takes place unless, in the meantime, a fresh licence has been taken from the Licensing Authority in the name of the firm with the changed constitution".

[No. F. 1-22/63-D.]

A. N. VARMA, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 27th April 1965

S.O. 1459.—Whereas, the Central Government have, in pursuance of the provisions of clause (b) of section 3 of the Pharmacy Act, 1948 (8 of 1948), nominated the following persons to be members of the Pharmacy Council of India with effect from 27th April, 1965:—

- (1) Shri K. C. Chatterjee, Ph.C., D.B.A. (G.B.) D.P.A. (G.B.), M/s Boots Pure Drugs Co., (India) Ltd., Bombay-22.
- (2) Dr. K. K. Kaishth, D. Pharm (Hons.), B.Sc., Ph.D., A.P.I.C., Superintendent, Pharmacy Post-graduate Medical College, Chandigarh.
- (3) Miss N. S. Gayatondy, B.Sc., (Hons.), M.Sc. (Tub.), Chief Pharmacist, Nair Hospital, Bombay.
- (4) Shri M. L. Shroff, Head of Department of Pharmacy, Jadavpur University, Calcutta.
- (5) Dr. R. B. Arora, Prof. of Pharmacology, All-India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi.

2. Now, therefore, in pursuance of the provisions of section 3 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Health No. F. 7-23/59-D, dated the 21st December, 1959, namely:—

In the said notification, under the heading "Member nominated by Central Government under clause (b)", for the existing entries against serial Nos. 1 to 4, the following entries shall respectively be substituted, namely:—

- (1) Dr. K. K. Kaishth, B. Pharm. (Hons.), B.Sc., Ph.D., A.P.I.C., Superintendent, Pharmacy Post-graduate Medical College, Chandigarh.
- (2) Miss N. S. Gayatondey, B.Sc. (Hons.), M.Sc. (Tub.), Chief Pharmacist, Nair Hospital, Bombay.
- (3) Prof. M. L. Shroff, Head of Department of Pharmacy, Jadavpur University, Calcutta.
- (4) Dr. R. B. Arora, Prof. of Pharmacology, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi.

Shri K. C. Chatterjee, appearing at serial No. 6 shall continue to be a member of the Council for a further period of five years with effect from the 21st December, 1964, or until his successor is nominated, whichever is longer.

[No. F. 6-2/64-MPT(Pt. II).]

B. B. L. BHARADWAJ, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT

(Transport Wing)

MERCHANT SHIPPING

New Delhi, the 22nd April 1965

S.O. 1460.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 11 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958 (44 of 1958), the Central Government hereby directs that at the port of Bedi Bunder, Jamnagar, the whole of the business of the shipping office shall be conducted at the office of the Surveyor-in-Charge, Mercantile Marine Department, Bedi Bunder, Jamnagar, and for the purposes of sub-section (4) of the said section, the Central Government further directs that the said business at that port shall be committed to the said Surveyor-in-Charge.

2. This notification shall be deemed to have come into effect on the 1st December, 1963.

[No. F. 24-MA(7)/63.]

D. S. NIM, Dy. Secy.

MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS

(Railway Board)

New Delhi, the 3rd May 1965

S.O. 1461.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clauses (f) and (g) of sub-section (1) of section 47 of the Indian Railways Act, 1890 (9 of 1890), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment to the rules published under

the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board) No. TCIII/3036/58, dated the 28th August, 1958, namely:—

In the said rules, rule 1 shall be lettered as clause (a) thereof and—

- (i) in clause (a) as so lettered, for the words "Wharfage may be charged at rates not exceeding those given in the following table:—", the following words shall be substituted, namely:—

"Except in the manner and to the extent stated in clause (b), wharfage may be charged at rates not exceeding those given in the following table:—

- (ii) after clause (a) as so lettered, the following clause shall be inserted, namely:—

"(b) In respect of consignments arriving at the destination very late, the free time and the rate of wharfage shall be as provided hereunder:

- (i) when a consignment (goods or parcels) reaches the destination after more than two months from the date of booking, the free time to be allowed shall be three days from the date of arrival, including the day of arrival;
- (ii) the rate of wharfage for the first ten days after expiry of the free time shall be 50 per cent of what is otherwise leviable; and
- (iii) in respect of the subsequent period, namely, the period up to the date of removal of the consignment, the wharfage to be levied shall be in accordance with the rules for the time being in force."

[No. TC/EP/204/64.]

P. C. MATHEW, Secy.

MINISTRY OF WORKS & HOUSING

New Delhi, the 27th April 1965

S.O. 1462.—In pursuance of the provisions of rule 45 of the Fundamental Rules the President is pleased to make the following further amendments to the Supplementary Rules issued with the Government of India, Finance Department letter No. 104-C.S.R., dated the 4th February, 1922, namely:—

In the said Supplementary Rules, in Part VIII, in Division XXVI-B, that is to say, in the Allotment of Government Residences (General Pool in Delhi) Rules, 1963;

- (i) in sub-rule (1) of S.R. 317-B-7, for the words "a residence, on falling vacant, will be allotted by the Director of Estates to an applicant", the words, letters and figures "a residence on falling vacant will be allotted by the Director of Estates preferably to an applicant desiring a change of accommodation in that type under the provisions of S.R. 317-B-15 and if not required for that purpose, to an applicant without accommodation in that type" shall be substituted;
- (ii) after S.R. 317-B-14 the following rule shall be inserted, namely:—

"Change of residence.—S.R. 317-B 15(1) An officer to whom a residence has been allotted under these rules may apply for a change to another residence of the same type or a residence of the type to which he is eligible under S.R. 317-B-5, whichever is lower. Not more than one change shall be allowed in respect of one type of residence allotted to the officer.

- (2) All applications for change made in the form prescribed by the Director of Estates and received upto the 19th day of a calendar month shall be included in the waiting list in the succeeding month. For purposes of this rule the officers whose names are included in the waiting list in an earlier month shall be senior *en bloc* to those whose names are included in the list in subsequent months. The *inter-se* seniority of the officers included in the list in any particular month shall be determined in the order of their priority dates.

- (3) Changes shall be offered in order of seniority determined in accordance with sub-rule (2) and having regard to the officers' preferences as far as possible.
- (4) An officer having allotment of a residence belonging to any pool mentioned in S.R. 317-B-8 shall be eligible only for a change to a residence of the same pool.
- (5) If an officer fails to accept a change of residence offered to him within five days of the issue of such offer or allotment, he shall not be considered again for a change of residence of that type.”;
- (iii) in S.R. 317-B-16, after the letters and figures “S.R. 317-B-8”, the word, letters and figures “or S.R. 317-B-15” shall be inserted.

[No. 3/41/63-Acc.I.]

S.O. 1463.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1958 (32 of 1958), the Central Government hereby appoints the officer mentioned in column 1 of the table below, being gazetted officer of Government, to be Estate Officer for the purposes of the said Act who shall exercise the powers conferred, and perform the duties imposed, on Estate Officers by or under the said Act within the local limits of their respective jurisdiction in respect of the public-premises specified in the corresponding entries in column 2 of the said table, with effect from the 30th January, 1965.

THE TABLE

Designation of officers	Categories of public premises and local limits of jurisdiction
1	2
Assistant Estate Manager to the Government of India, Bombay.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease or requisitioned by, or on behalf of the Central Government in Bombay except such of them as are under the administrative control of other estate officers.

[No. 32(3)/65-Acc.II.]

H. S. JAIN, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF REHABILITATION

(Office of the Chief Settlement Commissioner)

New Delhi, the 24th April 1965

S.O. 1464.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (1) of Section 4 of the Evacuee Interest (Separation) Act, 1951, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri K. L. Wason, Competent Officer, for the Union Territory of Himachal Pradesh also for the purpose of discharging the duties assigned to such Officers by or under the said Act, with effect from 15th April 1965 (After-noon).

[No. 13(4)AGZ/65.]

S.O. 1465.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (1) of Section 4 of the Evacuee Interest (Separation) Act, 1951, the Central Government hereby appoints for the Union Territory of Delhi, Shri K. L. Wason as Competent Officer for the purpose of discharging the duties assigned to the Competent Officer by or under the said Act, within the said Territory, with effect from the after-noon of the 15th April, 1965.

[No. 13(4)/AGZ/65.]

New Delhi, the 26th April 1965

S.O. 1466.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (1) of Section 3 of the Displaced Persons (Claims) Supplementary Act, 1954 (No. 12 of 1954) the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Radha Krishan as Settlement Officer for the purpose of performing the functions assigned to such officers by or under the said Act with effect from 16th April, 1965.

2. The Central Government also appoints Shri Radha Krishan as Additional Settlement Commissioner for the purpose of performing the functions assigned to such officers by or under the said Act with effect from the same date.

[No. 6/12/ARG/62.]

KANWAR BAHADUR,

Settlement Commissioner (A) &

Ex-Officio D. Secy.

(Office of the Regional Settlement Commissioner, Rajasthan)

ORDER

Jaipur, the 23rd April 1965

S.O. 1467.—In exercise of the powers vested in me under section 34 of the Displaced persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954, I hereby delegate my powers of determining under section 7(3) *ibid*, the net compensation payable to the claimants to Shri H. L. Dhawan and also authorise him under Rule 15 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Rules, 1955 to prepare summaries in Appendix VII and to sign the payment orders thereon with effect from 5th March 1965.

[No. RSCR/AO/Admn/1(32)/Policy/65/12633.]

GULAB L. AJWANI,

Regional Settlement Commissioner.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY

New Delhi, the 28th April, 1965.

S.O. 1468.—In pursuance of clause (a) of sub-paragraph (1) of paragraph 4 of the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints the Joint Secretary to the Government of Madras, (Labour and Transport), Industries, Labour and Co-operation Department, as the Chairman of the Regional Committee set-up for the State of Madras and makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour No. S.R.O. 3381 dated the 2nd November, 1954, namely:—

In the said notification in entry (1), for the words "Secretary to the Government of Madras, Industries, Labour and Cooperation Department, Fort St. George, Madras", the words "The Joint Secretary to the Government of Madras, (Labour and Transport), Department of Industries, Labour and Cooperation, Madras", shall be substituted.

[No. 12(8)64-PF.II.]

S.O. 1469.—In pursuance of clause (a) of sub-paragraph (1) of paragraph 4 of the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints the Secretary to the Government of Uttar Pradesh, Labour Department, as the Chairman of the Regional Committee for the State of Uttar Pradesh in the vacancy caused by the resignation of Shri R. H. Chishti and makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 1703 dated the 29th June, 1960, namely:—

In the said notification, against item (1), for the entry "Shri R. S. Chishti, Commissioner and Secretary to the Government of Uttar Pradesh, Labour Department, Lucknow", the entry "The Secretary to the Government of Uttar Pradesh, Labour Department, Lucknow" shall be substituted.

[No. 12/5/64-PF.II.]

New Delhi, the 3rd May 1965

S.O. 1470.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Jogendra Nath Narzary to be an Inspector for the

whole of the State of Assam for the purposes of the said Act or of any scheme framed thereunder, in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a mine or an oilfield, or a controlled industry.

[No. 20(80)/65-PF-I.]

DALJIT SINGH, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION & BROADCASTING

New Delhi, the 5th April, 1965.

S.O. 1471.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5(1) of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 and sub-rule (3) of rule 8 read with sub-rule 2 of rule 9 of the Cinematograph (Censorship) Rules, 1958, the Central Government hereby re-appoints Shri M.S.A. Majid as a member of the Advisory Panel of the said Board at Madras with effect from 5th April, 1965.

[No. 11/3/65-FC.]

R. B. SINHA, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 28th April, 1965

S.O. 1472.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5(1) of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 and sub-rule (3) of rule 8 read with sub-rule 2 of rule 9 of the Cinematograph (Censorship) Rules, 1958, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri P. V. Chalapati Rau after consultation with the Central Board of Film Censors, as a member of the Advisory Panel of the said Board at Madras with immediate effect.

[No. 11/3/65-FC.]

New Delhi, the 20th April 1965

S.O. 1473.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5(1) of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 and sub-rule (3) of rule 9 read with sub-rule (2) of rule 9 and sub-rule (3) of rule 8 of the Cinematograph (Censorship) Rules, 1958, the Central Government hereby re-appoints Shri P. Veeraraghavan after consultation with the Central Board of Film Censors, as a member of the Advisory Panel of the said Board at Madras with effect from 10th May, 1965.

[No. F. 11/3/65-FC.]

S.O. 1474.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5(1) of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 and sub-rule (3) of rule 8 read with sub-rule 2 of rule 9 of the Cinematograph (Censorship) Rules, 1958, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri K. Satyanarayana after consultation with the Central Board of Film Censors, as a member of the Advisory Panel of the said Board at Madras with immediate effect.

[No. 11/3/65-FC.]

S.O. 1475.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5(1) of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 and sub-rule (3) of rule 8 read with sub-rule 2 of rule 9 of the Cinematograph (Censorship) Rules, 1958, the Central Government hereby appoints Smt. Leela Menon after consultation with the Central Board of Film Censors as a member of the Advisory Panel of the said Board at Madras with immediate effect.

[No. 11/3/65-FC.]

H. N. AGARWAL, Dy. Secy.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR & EMPLOYMENT

New Delhi, the 27th April 1965

S.O. 1476.—The following draft of a scheme further to amend the Bombay Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1957, which the Central Government proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred

by sub-section (1) of section (4) of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), is published as required by the said sub-section for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby; and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the 1st June, 1965.

Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the date so specified will be taken into consideration by the Central Government.

Draft Scheme

1. This Scheme may be called the Bombay Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Scheme, 1965.

2. In the Bombay Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1957—

(a) in sub-clause (1) of clause 12A, after item (xvi) the following items shall be inserted, namely:—

“(xvi-A) Where, in a case reported to him under item (xvi), the Labour Officer is of opinion that the act of indiscipline or misconduct is so serious that the worker should not be allowed to work any longer, the Labour Officer may, pending investigation of the matter, suspend the worker for a period not exceeding seven days and report immediately to the Deputy Chairman, who after preliminary investigation of the matter shall pass orders thereon whether the worker should, pending final orders, remain suspended or not provided that the total period of such suspension shall not exceed a period of three months.

(xvi-B) Where the Deputy Chairman comes to the decision that the order of suspension of the worker pending investigation into the charge of indiscipline or misconduct, as the case may be, ought not to have been made, the worker shall be entitled to such payments from the Board in respect of the period of his suspension as the Administration Body may certify that the worker would have received, had he not been suspended.”

(b) in clause 16, for sub-clause (1), the following sub-clause shall be substituted:—

“(1) A listed worker who is aggrieved by an order of his employer under clause 14(4), may appeal to the Deputy Chairman whose decision thereon shall be final.”

[No. 530/10/65-Fac.]

K. D. HAJELA, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 27th April 1965

S.O. 1477.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Ramagundam Division of the Singareni Collieries Company Limited and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 23rd April 1965.

BEFORE THE HON'BLE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, ANDHRA PRADESH,
HYDERABAD

PRESENT:

Dr. Mir Sladat Ali Khan, M.A., LL.B., Fazel (Osm.); B.C.L., (Oxon.); D.Phil., (Oxon.); Bar-at-Law; (Lincoln's Inn) (London); Chairman, Industrial Tribunal, Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 49 OF 1964

BETWEEN

Workmen of Singareni Collieries Co. Limited, Kothagudium.

AND

Management, Singareni Collieries Co. Limited, Godavari Khanl.

APPEARANCES:

Sri M. Komarajah, General Secretary, Singareni Collieries Workers' Union,
—for Workmen.

Sri M. Shyam Mohan, Personnel Officer, Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd.,
—for the Management.

AWARD

By the Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's letter No. 7/19/64-LR II dated 6th November 1964 the industrial dispute between the employers of the Singareni Collieries Company Limited, and their workmen was referred for adjudication with the following issues framed viz.,

“(1) Whether the claim of the following fortyseven female mazdoors employed on clay pill making at Godavari Khani, Ramagundam division of Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., to be absorbed by the company and paid the wages and granted other benefits in accordance with the award of the All India Industrial Tribunal (Colliery Disputes) as modified by the decision of the Labour Appellate Tribunal of India dated the 29th January 1957 is justified?

1. Igati Ramamma.
2. Mesi Chinnamma.
3. Sulumalla Enkamma.
4. Kanaka Posamma.
5. Igati Mallamma.
6. Panja Rajamma.
7. Kamera Pedda Posam.
8. Thungapindi Mallamma.
9. Mallepalli Durgamma.
10. Inagam Lakshmi.
11. Medi Narsamma.
12. Bolepalli Radhamma.
13. Mede Posamma.
14. Thammalla Jakku.
15. Chippakurthi Lakshamma.
16. Kallepalli Komaramma.
17. Godamu Rajamma.
18. Desaboina Narsamma.
19. Inagam Venkamma.
20. Gollapalli Rajamma.
21. Kallepalli Lakshamma.
22. Akula Lakshamma.
23. Arla Balamma.
24. Santakari Banamma.
25. Masuri Bondamma.
26. Boddu Chinnamma.
27. Posula Rajamma.
28. Bathula Posamma.
29. Gunde Narsayya.
30. Malemu Banamma.
31. Thudi Bhudevi.
32. Nune Madhanamma.
33. Siriboina Posamma.
34. Nali Nasulamma.
35. Komma Lakshamma.
36. Parasa Lakshamma.

37. Thudi Santhamma.
38. Kondella Madhanamma.
39. Nali Rajamma.
40. Kirthi Rajamma.
41. Nali Venkamma.
42. Nali Chandramma.
43. Madhupurnam Rukkamma.
44. Dadi China Posam.
45. Dadi Pedá Posam.
46. Kandella Lakshmamma.
47. Nari Posam.

(2) If so, to what relief are the workmen entitled and from what date?"

2. The reference was registered here as I.D. No. 49/1964. Both the parties adduced evidence and filed some documents. Arguments have been heard. record my opinion below.

3. The employer's stand is that the women engaged in clay pill making are not the employees of the Singareni Collieries and, therefore, there is no industrial dispute here and I have no jurisdiction to enquire or adjudicate. The Company is not engaging any contractor. It is just purchasing the requisite number of clay pills. The demand that the benefits of the Coal Award should be conferred upon these women is incorrect, as the women making the clay pills are not the employees of the company. The learned representative of the employer, Sri Shyam Mohan, has enlarged upon this stand by contending that under section 2(h) of the Mines Act No. XXXV of 1952, it is necessary that these women should have been appointed by or with the knowledge of the employer and he has emphatically maintained that it is not proved that the 47 women were employed with the knowledge of the employer—Company. He has even questioned the number and has contended that, as stated in paragraph 5 of the counter, ten of them are not employed even by the supplier. He has cited the Assam Chah Karmachari Sangha v. Dimakuchi Tea Estate [1958 (I) LLJ page 500] and the Dharangadhra Chemical Works Limited and State of Saurashtra and others [1957 (I) LLJ page 477] for the proposition that to establish the relation of master and servant there must be supervision over the work of the servant. It is his eloquent stand that the company does not exercise any supervision and not even the supplier has any control over these 47 women. Lastly, he has contended that there is no record to show that these women have worked even from 1962.

4. I have considered the employer's stand and the argument of the learned representative. I am afraid I do not agree with him. Section 2(h) of the Mines Act is as follows:

"2(h): A person said to be "employed" in a mine who works under appointment by or with the knowledge of the manager, whether for wages or not, in any mining operation, or in cleaning or oiling any part of any machinery used in or about the mine, or in any other kind of work whatsoever incidental to, or connected with, mining operations;"

I have perused the deposition of M.W. 1. P. T. Thomas, Assistant Personnel Officer and that of M.W. 2, Sri N. Madhavrao, the so called supplier. After perusal I am left in no doubt that Madhavrao is a contractor for making clay pills. He has begun his deposition with the words, viz., "I have been taking contracts for supplying stone, sand, clay pills and gravel. At Ramagundam store, I supplied the things I mentioned above viz., stone, sand, gravel and clay pills. Gunde Narsiah (serial 29 of the list of 47 workmen given in the Schedule to the order of reference) is a cart-man as well as Mukkadam. He gives me the details of job done and wages due for the past week. Supervision over their work is done by the cart-man or Mukkadam Narsiah. Narsiah also supervises the coming and going of these women or their being late. The names given in the enclosure to Ex. M-4 page. -A are taken from my old register." It may be noted that all the above statements have been made by the contractor Madhavrao in examination-in-chief. In cross-examination he stated viz., "for clay pills making there is no tender. However, the company has fixed the rate of Rs. 2.08 P. for supply 1000 clay pills. NOW THE RATE HAS BEEN INCREASED FROM

2.08 P. to 2.50 P. PER 1000 PILLS. There is no other contractor for supplying clay pills except me. The women who have been working at Incline-1 are working continuously from May 1962. Before me there was another contractor. I do not know whether these women worked under him and for how long. In Godavari Khani I am supplying at Incline-I daily 33,000 pills and at Incline-V 13,000 clay pills." M.W. 1, Sri Thomas, has deposed that in Ex. M-2 he has given the correct names of the 47 women specified with the ages also. Evidently this signifies knowledge of the employer. Further, he has mentioned in cross-examination that these women work piece-rate and by that he has explained that he meant that they come at any time and go away at any time after making 1000 or 800 pills. This also shows knowledge.

4(1). My conclusions from the deposition of these two witnesses are that the women are working as employees of the contractor at least from May 1962. The contractor exercises supervision over them through Mukkadam Narsiah. Even their coming late is taken note of by him. The contractor has a register and the names supplied in Ex. M-4 are the names from that register. There is a categorical statement that all of them are working from May 1962. And even though the Contractor Madhavrao has deposed that in the case of clay pill making no tender was called but that he is the only contractor for supplying the clay pills and that there is no other contractor. The factum of his being a contractor is also established by this statement that he has used the word rate and not the word price for supplying 1000 clay pills. He has used the same word rate again when he stated that the rate was increased from Rs. 2.08 P. to Rs. 2.50 P. I, therefore, hold that I have no doubt that, on the record, these women are employed by the contractor of the company and under the definition of the 'employees' in the Standing Orders 2(a) an 'employee' means all work people, male or female, employed, above-ground or underground, either directly by the company or under a contractor or contractors. Thus, it is evident that these women are the employees of the company through the contractor and the Appellate Award of Sri Das Gupta dated 29th January 1957 explicitly lays down that the benefit awarded to the regular workmen should also be extended to the contract labour. I hold accordingly.

5. Only two things remain. One is whether there is any doubt about the self-same women having been working all the time. In this regard there is the explicit statement of the Contractor Madhavrao, M.W. 2, that all these women are working from May 1962, but, the employer in the counter has stated that the identity of 10 women is not established and some objection is also taken to the sur-names and the manner in which they are pronounced. It appears to me that except for one woman Inagam Venkamma or Janagam Venkamma who has left one year ago and in whose place the contractor has employed Kamera China Pochamma the objection is not correct. It is not established that the 10 women, serials 10, 19, 28, 29, 39, 41, 42, 44, 45 and 46 are not engaged by the contractor. The contractor, M.W. 2, has admitted that serial 10 Jangam Lakshmi, serial 41 Neeli Venkamma, serial 42. Neeli Chandramma and serial 44 Dadi China Posam, serial 45 Dadi Peda Posam are working. He has added that serial 28 Bathula Posamma is not working and he is not sure whether Kandella Lakshmmamma, serial 46, is also working. In my opinion, I have no reason to disbelieve the evidence of workmen's witnesses who have stated in clear words that at the time of reference all these 46 women mentioned in the Schedule to the order of reference were working. W.W. 1 has deposed that in the place of Serial 28 Bathula Pochamma the contractor has appointed S. Bhudevi; that serial 39 Nali or Neeli Rajamma, serial 41, Neeli or Nali Venkamma and serial 46 Kandella Laxamma are all working. This will show that all the 10 workers about whom it was said in the counter that they are not working are in fact working. Serial 29 is a man. He is the Mukkadam Narsiah, at serial 29. He is also working. I hold accordingly.

6. The other thing which has remained for consideration is that under the Appellate Das Gupta Award these 46 women are to be given the benefits of the Coal Award like any other regular workmen. I direct that the same should be conferred upon them together with Category I wages. There remain serial 29 the Mukkadam Narsiah. As he is included in the 47 women workmen and no separate wages were claimed for him in the claims statement, evidence or the argument, I inclined to the view that he should also be given the Category-I wages. But Mukkadam for female workmen finds a mention in the Wage Schedule of the Company. The same may be given to him. In any case the company has departmentalized clay-pill making in other divisions. The same wages as paid there to Mukkadams may be paid to him. The question is from what date. As far as I could gather from the record the date of conciliation is

27th July 1964. I, therefore, direct that the same benefits may be given to them from that date.

Award accordingly, given under my hand and the seal of the Court, this the 19th day of April, 1965.

(Sd.) M. S. ALI KHAN,
Industrial Tribunal.

Witnesses examined for:

Workmen:

- W.W. 1: M. Bhaskerrao.
- W.W. 2: D. Narsamma.
- W.W. 3: Dadi China Posu

Management:

- M.W. 1: P. T. Thomas.
- M.W. 2: N. Madhavarao.
- M.W. 3: Smt. B. Radhamma.
- M.W. 4: Gunde Narsalah.

Documents exhibited by Workmen:

- Ex. W1: Memo. of settlement reached during conciliation proceedings between the workmen and the employers of Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd. dated 30th November 1963.
- Ex. W2: Letter from the Conciliation Officer (Central), Hyderabad addressed to the Chief Labour Commissioner, New Delhi.
- Ex. W3: Minutes of section discussions held during the conciliation proceedings on 17th August 1964.
- Ex. W4: Memo. of agreement dated 30th October 1961 reached between the employers in the Coal Industry represented by the Indian Mining Association, Indian Mining Federation and the Indian Colliery Owners Association and their workmen represented by the Indian National Mine Workers Federation, Koyala Mazdur Panchayat, Colliery Mazdoor Congress, Hind Mazdoor Sabha and the Indian Mine Workers Federation.
- Ex. W5: Memo. of settlement between the Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd. and their workmen during the course of conciliation proceedings on 25th June 1960.

Documents exhibited by the Employers:

- Ex. M1: Letter dated 24th July 1964 from the General Secretary of the Workers Union to the Conciliation Officer, Hyderabad.
- Ex. M2: List of 47 workmen as given in the reference along with the corrected names as verified.
- Ex. M3: Certificate dated 21st March 1965 from the Sarpanchi.
- Ex. M4: List of documents furnished along with list of witnesses.
- Ex. M4/1: Statement furnished by the Contractor.
- Ex. M4/2B: Another statement furnished by the Contractor.
- Ex. M4/3: List of 39 workmen that worked from 3rd January 1964 to 21st October 1964.
- Ex. M4/4: Another list of 43 workmen with other particulars furnished by the Contractor, N. Madhavarao.
- Ex. M5: Clay pills register for 1964.

(Sd.) M. S. ALI KHAN,
Industrial Tribunal.

[No. 7/19/64/LRII.]

New Delhi, the 29th April 1965

S.O. 1478.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Bombay, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Birsinghpur Colliery of Messrs. Johilla Coalfields Private Limited, Post Office, Birsinghpur Pali, District Shahdol and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 23rd April, 1965.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT BOMBAY.

REFERENCE No. C.G.I.T. 43 OF 1963.

Employers in relation to Birsinghpur Colliery of Messrs. Johilla Coalfields Private Limited.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT:

Shri Salim M. Merchant.—*Presiding Officer.*

For the employers.—Shri B. J. Nagrath, Governing Director with Shri K. C. Jain, General Manager.

For the workmen.—Shri S. R. Paliwal, President, Shri G. C. Jaiswal, General Secretary, Shri A. Rahman, Vice-President, and Shri K. B. Chougule, Member, Executive Committee, Johilla Colliery Mazdoor Sangh.

Bombay, dated this 19th day of April, 1965.

INDUSTRY: Coal Mining.

STATE: Madhya Pradesh.

AWARD

The Central Government, by the Ministry of Labour and Employment's Order No. 8/125/63 LR II dated 8th October, 1963, made, on a joint application of the parties, under sub-section 2 of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (section XIV of 1947), was pleased to refer the industrial dispute between the parties above-named in respect of the following subject matters specified in annexure II to the said order, to me for adjudication.

ANNEXURE II

1. Whether the miners' demand that they should not be asked to help the drill operators as required to do at present is justified.

2. Whether the miners are entitled to any additional payment for having done the above job in the past or the present rates paid cover the above and other ancillary jobs. In case the workers' demand is justified what relief they are entitled.

3. Whether the miners are justified in claiming additional payment for carrying earthen pallets underground or the payment for the same is covered by the existing rate. In case the workers' demand is justified what relief they are entitled.

4. Whether the existing piece rate for miners will need to be revised and if so, to what extent in case the existing practices of helping the drillers and carrying pallets underground by the miners are to be stopped.

After the parties had filed their written statements, at the adjourned hearing of this dispute before me at Bombay on 19th April, 1965, after some discussion, the parties recorded that "in view of the fact that the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Coal Mining Industry, in India (hereinafter referred to as the Coal Wage Board) are expected to be made in the near future, and considering the other facts and circumstances of the case, the parties, without prejudice to their respective contentions, leave it to me (the Tribunal) to fix such amount of increase in the existing rate of Rs. 2.91 per tub of 47.25 c.f.f. paid to the miners of the Birsinghpur Colliery as I consider fair and reasonable, as also the date from which the rate fixed by me shall come into operation and the compensation to be paid to the miners upto the date of the new rate fixed by me is to come into force, provided that such increased rate should be directed to remain in force till the wage rates, and the wage structure and method of payment recommended by the Coal Wage Board will come into force, when the awarded rate of payment will be replaced by the recommendations of the Coal Wage Board."

After taking into consideration the subject matters under reference and the submission of the parties and the facts and circumstances stated above, I award that the existing rate of Rs. 2.91 ps. per tub of 47.25 c.f.t. paid to the miners should be increased to Rs. 2.94 ps. per tub of 47.25 c.f.t. with effect from 1st June, 1965. I further direct that the awarded rate fixed by me shall remain in force till the wage rates and the wage structure and the method of payment recommended by the Coal Wage Board will come into force when the rate of payment awarded by me herein for the miners will be replaced by the wage rates, the wage structure and the method of payment for miners, recommended by the Coal Wage Board.

I further direct that compensation at the rate of Rs. 10 per month per miner on the rolls of the colliery as on 1st June, 1965, shall be paid in full satisfaction of the claims herein. Such payment to be made by 20th June, 1965.

The Union has pressed for cost and considering that the representatives of the Union had to attend the hearing of this dispute at Bombay, I award Rs. 300 as costs in favour of the Union, also to be paid by 20th June, 1965.

(Sd.) SALIM M. MERCHANT

Presiding Officer.

[No. 8/125/63-LR. II.]

New Delhi, the 30th April 1965

S.O. 1479.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Selected Searsole Colliery, P.O. Raniganj, District Burdwan (West Bengal) and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 26th April, 1965.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, CALCUTTA

REFERENCE No. 44 OF 1964

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the Selected Searsole Colliery.

AND

Their workmen.

PRESENT:

Shri L. P. Dave—*Presiding officer.*

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of employers.—Shri H. L. Tandon, Agent.

On behalf of workmen.—Shri N. D. Advocate.

STATE: West Bengal.

INDUSTRY: Coal Mines.

AWARD

The Government of India Ministry of Labour and Employment, by their Order No. 6/55/64-LR.II dated 25th July 1964, have referred the industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the Selected Searsole Colliery and their workmen in respect of the question whether the action of the management in dismissing Sri Sanatan Majhi, Pick Miner, by its letter dated 23rd May 1964 was legal and justified and if not, to what relief the workman was entitled, for adjudication to this Tribunal.

2. In response to notices issued by the Tribunal, the workmen represented by the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha filed a written statement contending *inter alia* that the management began to weed out the employees belonging to the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha by dismissal, discharge and refusal of employment and in a number of other ways and began to take new hands in their places; that the case of Sanatan Majhi is one of such glaring instances of victimisation and unfair labour practice; that the said workman is the executive member of the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, Selected Searsole Colliery branch; that on 8th April 1964 he was served with a back-dated chargesheet containing false and malicious charges. He replied to it on 8th April 1964. While this matter was still under investigation, he was again served with another chargesheet dated 16th April 1964 containing baseless charges and to this also he gave his reply. After this, he was

asked to attend an enquiry. His repeated representation to be represented by Sri Dutta, an employee of the Company and/or the Vice-President of the Union were turned down. So he went there to participate in the enquiry with protest. But he was neither allowed to produce any defence witness nor was any enquiry held to his knowledge. Thereafter he was dismissed by a letter dated 23rd May 1964. He was not guilty of any misconduct and the action of the management was illegal, *mala fide* and against all principles of natural justice. It was therefore urged that he should be ordered to be reinstated with payment of full back wages.

3. The employers filed a written statement contending *inter alia* that the case of Sanatan Majhi was not a case of victimisation; that the employers had no knowledge of Sanatan's union activities; that Sanatan was chargesheeted for robbing pillars on 3rd April 1964 and for stealing pick axe of a co-worker named Alijan Mia on 15th April 1964; that he submitted his replies to the chargesheets denying the allegations and raising pleas of victimisation; that proper enquiries were held by the employers in respect of the two chargesheets and the workman was given opportunity to participate in the same; that the enquiry in respect of the chargesheet dated 3rd April 1964 was held on 14th May 1964 and the enquiry in respect of the other chargesheet was held on 21st May 1964; that the workman intentionally and deliberately refrained from participating in the enquiries; that he has been rightly dismissed by the management and his dismissal is *bona fide*.

4. The present dispute relates to the dismissal of a workman named Sanatan Majhi who had been working as a pick miner in the Selected Searsole Colliery for about 10 years. A chargesheet dated 3rd April 1964 was served on him. It was alleged therein that he had committed pillar robbing in a particular depillaring section and he was asked to give his explanation within 24 hours of the receipt of this chargesheet. He replied to this on 8th April 1964 alleging that the charges were concocted, preplanned, motivated and were made with ulterior motives to harass and victimise the workman because he, along with others, had refused to give up membership of the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha though asked to do so by the management. An enquiry regarding this chargesheet was ordered to be held on 25th April 1964 and a letter to this effect was issued on 10th April 1964. On 16th April 1964 the workman wrote to the manager saying that he was not able to read and write and requested that the management may kindly allow the Union Secretary, Shri S. C. Dutta or the Union Vice-President, Shri Robin Chatterjee to be present at the time of the enquiry. A reply to this letter was sent on 3rd May 1964 wherein it was stated that the workman's request to bring an union official would not be allowed, but he may bring one or two literate co-workers who were in colliery's employment at the time. The letter further mentioned that the enquiry proposed to be held on 25th April 1964 had been adjourned to 14th May 1964 and he should attend the same.

5. It is alleged that an enquiry was duly held on 14th May 1964. According to the management, the workman was not present at the enquiry. On the other hand, the workman says that he was present at the enquiry but no enquiry was held in his presence; that no witnesses were examined in his presence (and naturally he had no opportunity to cross examine them) and lastly, that he got no opportunity to give defence witnesses.

6. In the meanwhile, a second chargesheet had been served on this workman on 16th April 1964 wherein it was alleged that he was found carrying two coal cutting pick axes while coming out of the mine at the end of the second shift of 12th April 1964; that on enquiry he said that the extra pick axe had been handed over to him by a mining sirdar Ramjiban Singh; that the pick axe actually belonged to one Alijan Mia; that he was thus guilty of two offences, one of stealing of a pick axe and the second of throwing the responsibility thereof on another person. He was also asked to give his explanation to this chargesheet within twentyfour hours. He replied to it stating that the allegations against him were false and were made with ulterior motives and for harassing and victimising him because he had refused to give up membership of the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha. An enquiry was ordered to be held on 9th May 1964. On 3rd May 1964, the workman made a request to be allowed to be represented by the union Secretary, Sri Dutta or Vice-President, Shri Robin Chatterjee. On 8th May 1964 a reply was sent refusing his request but informing him that he could bring one or two of his literate co-workers with him. He was further informed that the enquiry would be held on 21st May 1964.

7. An enquiry was held on 21st May 1964. According to the management, the workman did not appear at the enquiry and it was held *ex-parte*. On the other hand, the workman says that he was present but no enquiry was held in his

presence. No witnesses were examined and naturally he was not allowed to cross examine the witnesses nor was any opportunity given to him to examine defence witnesses.

8. Ultimately a letter dated 23rd May 1964 was sent to the workman, informing him that he was found guilty of the charges which were the subject matters of the above two chargesheets. The letter then mentioned that a complaint had been received by the management that the workman was threatening others and asking them to join the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha and this conduct was very objectionable. Then the letter further mentioned that when he had fallen ill he was issued with a fitness certificate on 17th May 1964 and still he did not approach the manager till 22nd May 1964 for resuming duty. Lastly, the letter mentioned (in last para) "All the above actions of yours prove that you have the least regard to the discipline and order of the management and hence the management had decided to dismiss you from your service with immediate effect and you are directed to collect your final dues if any on any working day". It is this dismissal which is the subject matter of the present reference.

9. In support of their case, the union have examined the workman concerned, Sanatan Majhi. He has stated that though he was present at the time of both the enquiries, no witnesses were examined in his presence nor were his witnesses allowed to be examined. He has also denied the allegations made against him in the two chargesheets. As against this, the employers have not led any evidence. They have not examined either of the Enquiry Officers who held the two enquiries nor have they examined the manager or any other witness in support of the allegations made by them against the workman.

10. The law regarding the powers of a tribunal when dealing with matters of this type is now well settled. When a proper enquiry has been held by an employer and as a result thereof the workman is dismissed, the tribunal would not ordinarily interfere unless it is satisfied that the enquiry was not proper or that principles of natural justice were not followed or that it was a case of victimisation or unfair labour practice or that there were malafides or that the finding of the enquiry officer was perverse. The tribunal is not sitting in appeal against the finding of the enquiry officer and cannot go into the reliability or sufficiency of the evidence. On the other hand, if the enquiry is found to be improper, the tribunal can go into the merits of the case and decide the allegations on the strength of evidence produced before it.

11. In the present case, there have been two chargesheets in respect of two offences. I shall deal with them one by one. The first is a chargesheet dated 3rd April 1964 alleging that the workman was guilty of pillar robbing. An enquiry was held in this chargesheet on 14th May 1964. As I said above, the workman has said that he was present at the enquiry but no witnesses were examined in his presence, that is, no enquiry was held in his presence. He had no opportunity to cross examine the witnesses nor had he any opportunity to examine defence witnesses. I believe him. There is no evidence to the contrary. It may be noted that the enquiry was held by Shri Tandon, the agent of the colliery, who conducted the case before the tribunal on behalf of the management. Shri Tandon should have gone into the witness box, but has not done so and an adverse inference must be drawn against him for this. Thus, on the strength of the evidence of the workman, I would hold that no proper enquiry was held in the matter.

12. Apart from this, however, there are at least two gross irregularities or illegalities in the matter. The first is about the date on which the alleged enquiry was held. As I mentioned earlier, the enquiry was originally fixed for 25th April 1964 but by a letter of 3rd May 1964 it was adjourned to 14th May 1964. The original enquiry papers have been produced before me. The first page thereof starts with the statement "proceeding of an enquiry held on 14th May 1964 at 9-30 a.m. in the general office of the colliery in connection with the chargesheet issued to Sanatan Majhi". After mentioning that the workman had not turned up and the matter was proceeded ex-parte, the statement of the manager Shri L. N. Mallik was recorded. After the statement was completed, we find the signature of Shri Mallik with the date 14th May 1964 and the initials of Shri Tandon who was holding the enquiry also with the date 14th May 1964 written there. Though some portion of the paper was blank, the next statement appears to have been recorded on a separate paper. Actually I find that there are four other statements of R. N. Tiwari (Overman), Jugal Mja (Pick Miner), Alijan (Pick Miner) and D. K. Gupta (Asstt. Manager). All these statements have been recorded on separate sheets of paper though there was sufficient blank space to record the statement after the earlier statement was completed. I do

not know how if an enquiry was held at a stretch, the statements were not recorded in continuation without keeping any portion of the paper blank.

13. Apart from this, the most important thing to be noted is that below all these four statements the persons making the statements put their signatures with the date 25th April 1964. Similarly Shri Tandon also put his initials on each sheet with the date 25th April 1964. This date 25th April 1964 has subsequently been over-written by the date 14th May 1964 without any initials. When at the time of arguments, I asked the explanation of Shri Tandon as to how the original date was written as 25th April 1964, he said that it must have been written erroneously. I cannot believe that different persons could make the identical mistake in the date nor can I believe that the identical mistake would be made at eight places. The only conclusion I can draw from this is that the statements must have been recorded on 25th April 1964 and subsequently the dates have been changed to 14th May 1964 to make a show that they were recorded on that date. In other words, no enquiry was held on 14th May 1964 and the workman's statement to this effect is borne out by this circumstance.

14. There is one other significant irregularity regarding this enquiry and it is that the enquiry was held by Shri Tandon who was the agent of the colliery. After the enquiry, he is said to have made a report about his finding to the manager (who is subordinate to him) recommending the dismissal of the workman. The manager then wrote out that he perused the report and recommended his dismissal and after this Shri Tandon, as agent, made an endorsement that the recommendation for dismissal was approved. Under the standing orders, the manager has to obtain approval of his higher officer before he could dismiss a workman and that is why he had to obtain the above approval of Shri Tandon. The most surprising part of it is that Shri Tandon was himself the enquiry officer and as an enquiry officer he had already recommended dismissal and he himself approves of it as the agent! When Shri Tandon was asked about this at the time of arguments, his explanation was that he had held the enquiry in his personal capacity while the approval of dismissal was in his capacity as agent. This is not true. The statements recorded by Shri Tandon have been signed by him as agent, showing that he was holding the enquiry as agent and not in his personal capacity. But even assuming that he had held the enquiry in his personal capacity, even then it was not proper that he should approve of the action as agent. It is as if he was sitting in appeal against his own order. Human nature being what it is, one cannot expect that he would be able to take a dispassionate view of his earlier proposal. The standing orders require approval of a higher authority with the purpose that an independent person should be able to apply his mind to the facts of the case before approving of dismissal of a workman. Here Shri Tandon had already made up his mind when he held the enquiry and he could not bring an independent mind when he approved of that action. Thus, so far as this enquiry is concerned, the dismissal would be illegal as not having been approved by a proper higher authority.

15. I now come to the second chargesheet. Here the evidence before me is only that of the workman who has said that he was present at the time fixed for the enquiry but no enquiry was held in his presence and no witnesses were examined in his presence and he got no opportunity to cross examine them. There is no evidence to the contrary. This enquiry is said to have been held by the Assistant Manager who has not been examined before me. I hold that this enquiry was also improper.

16. Incidentally I may mention here that this charge relates to the stealing of a pick axe belonging to one Alijan Mia and to the effect that the workman tried to pass on the responsibility of the theft on a person named Ramjiban Singh. It appears that from the very beginning the workman's case has been that the pick axe had been given to him by Ramjiban Singh, who, it may be noted, was a mining sirdar. If he had asked the workman to carry the pick axe with him, he would normally do so. Though the management have charged him with trying to foist the responsibility on Ramjiban Singh falsely, no attempt has been made to examine Ramjiban Singh before the enquiry officer. In other words, the explanation of the workman was rejected without the person having been examined. In any case, when an illiterate workman was unrepresented at the inquiry, it was the duty of the enquiry officer to have called this person to verify whether the allegation made by the workman about the pick axe having been given to him was correct or not.

17. I thus hold that both the enquiries were not proper and the dismissal of the workman cannot be justified on the basis of the findings given in the two enquiries. Of course, it would have been open to the management to support

the dismissal by leading evidence before the tribunal in support of the allegations made in the chargesheets but they have not done so. On the other hand, the workman has denied these allegations.

18. I may also mention here that the order of dismissal cannot be supported on one more ground and it is that the order of dismissal is passed not only on the facts mentioned in the two chargesheets but on other grounds also. It is not clear as to what weighed with the dismissing authority when the order of dismissal was passed. I need not however discuss the matter further in view of the definite clear conclusion to which I have come and it is that no (proper) enquiry was held in the case and that the workman got no opportunity to cross examine the witnesses or leading defence witness. It may also be noted that the workmen's case has been from the very beginning that the false chargesheets were issued against him because of his trade union activities. There appears to be some force in this.

19. In the result, I hold that the dismissal of the workman Shri Sanatan Majhi is not legal or justified. He is ordered to be reinstated and to be paid all his wages and all other benefits which he would have got if he had been in service all along. The arrears of wages should be paid to him within one month of the award becoming enforceable. The management shall also pay Rs. 100/- as costs to the union.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE,
Presiding Officer.

Dated,
21st April 1965

[No. 6/55/64-LR-II.]

New Delhi, the 1st May 1965

S.O. 1480.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the East Jemehari Colliery, P.O. Raniganj, District Burdwan and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 26th April, 1965.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, CALCUTTA

REFERENCE No. 5 OF 1965

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the East Jemehari Colliery,

AND

Their workmen.

PRESENT:

Shri L. P. Dave—Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of employers.—Shri C. L. Daga, Partner.

On behalf of workmen.—Shri Robin Chatterjee, Vice-President, Colliery Mazdoor Sabha.

STATE: West Bengal.

INDUSTRY: Coal Mines.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment, by their order No. 6/116/64-LR.II, dated 5th January 1965, have referred the industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the East Jemehari Colliery and their workmen in respect of the question whether the management were justified in dismissing Sri Nishapati Roy, Surveyor, and if not, to what relief he was entitled, for adjudication to this Tribunal.

2. In response to notices issued by the Tribunal, both parties filed written statements. The matter was then fixed for hearing and evidence was commenced to be recorded. The workmen had closed their case and the manager was being examined on behalf of the employers. At this stage there were discussions between the parties for a compromise and ultimately they entered into a compromise and produced a memorandum of settlement before me, copy thereof is appended herewith.

3. The present dispute relates to the dismissal of a surveyor. Under the terms of the settlement, the workmen do not press for his claim of reinstatement. The employers have agreed to pay a sum of Rs. 1,500 in full and final settlement of all his claims from the employers. In my opinion, the compromise is fair and reasonable. I therefore accept it.

I pass an award in terms of the compromise.

Dated;

The 21st April, 1965.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE,
Presiding Officer.

BEFORE SRI L. P. DAVE, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, CALCUTTA

REFERENCE NO. 5 OF 1965

Employers in relation to East Jemehari Colliery

AND

Their workmen represented by the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha.

The humble petition of compromise between the employers and the union above named,

Most respectfully sheweth:

1. that the parties above named have settled the dispute amicably on the following Terms:

- (a) that Shri Nishapati Roy will have no claim for reinstatement or employment in the above company.
- (b) that the company will pay a sum of Rs. 1,500 (Rupees fifteen hundred) only in full and final satisfaction of his claim from the employer including leave and other dues if any.
- (c) that Nishapati Roy states that he has given up possession of the quarter allotted to him by the employer and the employer can occupy the same at any time.
- (d) that the above payment of Rs. 1,500 (Rupees fifteen hundred only) will be made before the Labour Inspector (Central), Ranigunj in presence of the Vice-President of the Union, on the 3rd May 1965 between 3 to 4 p.m.
- (e) that the Manager of the said colliery will give to Shri Nishapati Roy his working certificate at the time of aforesaid payment.

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that Hon'ble Tribunal will be graciously pleased to pass an Award in terms of the said settlement,

And for this act of kindness the parties hereto shall ever pray.

ROBIN CHATTERJEE,
Vice-President,
Colliery Mazdoor Sabha
(for the workmen)

CHIRANJILAL DAGA,
21-4-65.
Partner of the Colliery.
(for the Employer).
21.4.1965.
NISHAPATI ROY,

Dated, 21st April, 1965.

(Sd.) Illegible
Manager,
East Jemehari Colliery.
21-4-1965.

[No. 6/116/64/LRII.]

S.O. 1481.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Jamuria A & B Pits Colliery of M/s. Equitable Coal Co. Ltd., P.O. Dishergarh, Burdwan and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 26th April, 1965.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, CALCUTTA

REFERENCE No. 9 OF 1965

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the Jamuria A & B Pits Colliery of M/s. Equitable Coal Co. Ltd.,

AND

Their workmen.

PRESENT:

Shri L. P. Dave—Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of employers.—Shri S. K. Bhattacharya, Labour Adviser.

On behalf of workmen.—Shri Jagannath Pandey, Vice-President, Colliery Mazdoor Congress, Goral Mansion.

STATE: West Bengal.

INDUSTRY: Coal Mines.*

AWARD

There was an industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Equitable Coal Co., Ltd., and their workmen on the question whether the dismissal of a Depot Peon named Shri Magina Choubey and Jamuria A & B Pits Colliery was justified and if not, to what relief he was entitled. The parties to the dispute jointly applied to the Central Government for reference of the above to the Tribunal and thereupon the Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment, by their Order No. 8/104/64-LR.II, dated 16th January 1965, have referred the said dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal.

2. When the matter came up for hearing before me to-day, the parties after some discussion entered into a compromise and produced a memorandum of settlement, copy appended herewith. The dispute relates to the dismissal of a peon Magina Choubey. Under the terms of the settlement, he is to be reinstated from 26th April 1965 and there is to be continuity of service by treating the period of unemployment as leave without pay. In my opinion, the compromise is fair and reasonable.

I therefore accept the compromise and pass an award in terms thereof.

Dated,

The 22nd April, 1965.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE,
Presiding Officer.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, CALCUTTA

REFERENCE No. 9 OF 1965

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to Jamuria A & B Pits Colliery of Messrs. Equitable Coal Co. Ltd.

AND

Their workmen represented by the Colliery Mazdoor Congress, Goral Mansion, Asansol

AND

In the matter of joint petition of compromise,

The aforesaid petition most respectfully sheweth:

That the dispute has been settled mutually on the following terms:

1. Shri Magina Choubey will be reinstated and will join duty from 26th April, 1965.
2. That the period of unemployment will be treated as leave without pay for the purpose of continuity of service only.
3. That the parties will bear their own costs.

Under the above it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal will be graciously pleased to pass an award in terms of the said compromise,

And for this act of kindness, the petitioners as in duty bound shall ever pray,
(for Workmen).

(for Employers).

J. Pandey,
Vice-President,
Colliery Mazdoor Congress.
22-4-1965.

(Sd.) Illegible,

Dated,

The 22nd April, 1965.

(Magina Choubey).

[No. 8/104/64-LR.II.]

New Delhi, the 3rd May 1965

S.O. 1482.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act, from Sarvashri Padam Bahadur Gurang and Birbal Pun, watchmen of the Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited, Jamadoba, Post Office Jealgora, District Dhanbad, which was received by the Central Government on the 28th April, 1965.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, DHANBAD

In the matter of a Complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947).

COMPLAINT NO. 5 OF 1965

(arising out of Reference Nos. 39 of 64, 63 of 63, 46 of 64, 31 of 64 and 67 of 63).

PARTIES:

1. Padam Bahadur Gurang,
2. Birbal Pun, Watchmen, c/o Presiding, Congress Mazdoor Sangh, Jorapekhar No. IX P.O. Jealgora, Dt. Dhanbad—Complainants.

Versus

M/s. Tata Iron and Steel Co. Ltd., Jamadoba, P.O. Jealgora, Dt. Dhanbad—
Opposite Party.

Present:

Sri Raj Kishore Prasad, M.A., B.L., Presiding Officer.

STATE: Bihar.

INDUSTRY: Coal

Dhanbad, dated the 20th April, 1965

AWARD

This complaint was made under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by Sarvashri Padam Bahadur Gurang and Birbal Pun, Watchmen of the Tata Iron and Steel Co. Ltd., Jamadoba, Opposite Party, on 10th February 1965 complaining against their dismissal with effect from 18th November 1964.

2. On 19th April 1965 a petition of withdrawal signed by Sri B. N. Sharma, President, Congress Mazdoor Sangh, representing the two complainants, was

received in which it was stated that the company opposite party had reinstated the complainants in service and both of them were now working and, therefore, there was no dispute now between the parties, and, as such the complainants may be permitted to withdraw their joint complaint.

3. In these circumstances, the complainants are permitted to withdraw their joint complaint.

4. This is the award which I make and submit to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment, under Section 15 of the Act.

(Sd.) RAJ KISHORE PRASAD,
Presiding Officer,

Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.

[No. 8/189/63-LR.II.]

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 27th April 1965

S.O. 1483.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an Industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Belampalli Division of Singareni Collieries Company, Limited Belampalli P.O. (Andhra Pradesh) and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal, with Dr. Mir Sladat Ali Khan as the Presiding Officer, with Headquarters at Somajiguda, Hyderabad, and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited was justified in suspending from service and refusing payment of wages to Sarvashri Bestha Venkaty and Waheed Khan, for a period of eight days with effect from the 30th December, 1964? If not to what relief are the workmen entitled?

[No. 7/5/65-LR.II.]

New Delhi, the 29th April 1965

S.O. 1484.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Nandini Kundini Quarry of Bhilai Steel Project, Post Office Ahiwara, District Durg, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Bombay, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the management of Bhilai Steel Project is justified in denying the benefit of mines allowance to its workmen employed at Nandini Kundini quarry and if not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?

[No. F. 22/42/64-LR.I.]

S.O. 1485.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the New Tetturya Colliery of Messrs Tentulia Khas Collieries Limited, Post Office Malkera, District Dhanbad, and Messrs Karamchand Thapar and Brothers (Private) Limited, Thapar House, 25 Brabourne Road, Calcutta, of the one part and their workmen of the other part, in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

- (1) Whether the action of the management of the New Tetturya Colliery of Messrs Tentulia Khas Collieries Limited and Messrs Karamchand Thapar and Brothers (Private) Limited, in dismissing S/Shri Shyamlal Dusad, Fireman, and Satnarayan Passi, Winding Engine Khalasi, from service with effect from the 13th February, 1965, amounts to an act of victimisation?
- (2) If so, to what relief are the workmen or either of them entitled?

[No. 1/8/65-LR.II.]

New Delhi, the 1st May 1965

S.O. 1486.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Tarmi Colliery Company, Post Office Turiyo, District Hazaribagh, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

- (1) Whether the termination with effect from the 6th May 1964 of the services of the following 28 workmen by the management of the Tarmi Colliery Company was justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?

1. Sukhram Bilaspuri.
2. Sukhram Bilaspuri.
3. Radheshyam Bilaspuri.
4. Duleshwari Kamin.
5. Suritram Bilaspuri.
6. Udayanath Munda.
7. Sudhu Munda.
8. Bhagatram Bilaspuri.
9. Bodhnath Munda.
10. Sowna Munda.
11. Shanti Kamin.
12. Butni Kamin.
13. Jagni Kamin.
14. Tulsi Urawn.
15. Soma Urawn.
16. Phagni Kamin.
17. Mahangu Urwan.
18. Mahabir Bhunya.
19. Ramsahi Bhunya.
20. Lalia Kamin.
21. Fulmani Kamin.
22. Barban Turi.
23. Pachia Kamin.
24. Mahabir Turi.
25. Bilsa Kamin.
26. Ketu Turi.
27. Sugia Kamin.
28. Janki Mahte.

- (2) Whether the action of the management of the Tarmi Colliery Company in employing about 35 fresh hands with effect from the 28th September 1964 without offering those jobs to the old workmen (whose services were terminated with effect from the 23rd March 1964 and the 6th May 1964) was justified? If not, to what relief are the said workmen entitled?

[No. 2/3/65-LR.II.]

New Delhi, the 3rd May 1965

S.O. 1487.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Sripur Colliery of Loadna Colliery Company (1920) Ltd. P.O. Kalipahari (Burdwan) and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the dismissal of the following 25 C.P. Miners of Sripur Colliery by the management of Loadna Colliery Company (1920) Ltd. with effect from the 8th November, 1961 was justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?

1. Ch. Sukdeo Pashi.
2. Rajaram Pashi.
3. Chandi Pashi.
4. Bara Sukdeo Pashi.
5. Nankoo Pashi.
6. Jodha Khatik.
7. Bhadaï Khatik.
8. Mohan Khatik.
9. Hiralall Khatik.
10. Chhota Koïri.
11. Chaitu Koïri.
12. Johawir Koïri.
13. Sew Nath Koïri.
14. Raghubir Koïri.
15. Maiku Koïri.
16. Dulare Koïri.
17. Chhedi Mia.
18. Ramraj Rabidas.
19. Ramjiwan Rabidas.
20. Ramdas Rabidas.
21. Balgobind Koïri.
22. Jagarnath Ahir.
23. Ram Abatar Koïri.
24. Lall Khatik.
25. Manbodh Koïri.

[No. 6/12/65-LRII.]

H. C. MANGHANI, Under Secy.

ORDER

New Delhi, the 3rd May 1965

S.O. 1488.—Whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to Messrs Steelcrete (Private) Limited, Visakhapatnam and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

1. Whether the demand of the Union for removal from service of the two newly recruited Crane Drivers (Sarvashri Kanubhai Patel and G. Adinarayana) is justified
2. Whether the demand of the Union for removal of the two newly appointed riggers, (Sarvashri Dilip Singh and Guru Dayal Singh) is justified?
3. Whether Sri G. Yellaiah, driver is entitled to driver's wages on the days when he worked as rigger? If so, from what date?
4. Whether the demand of the Union for payment of Rs. 10 per day to Sri M. M. Patel, Supervisor, is justified? If so, from what date?

[No. 28/31/65-LRIV.]

O. P. TALWAR, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM & CHEMICALS

New Delhi, the 22nd April 1965

S.O. 1489.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from the drill sites to collecting stations within the Ankleshwar Oilfield in Gujarat State, Pipelines should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission and that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto.

2. Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein.

3. Any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority at Lalitchandra Maganbhai Patel's Building, 4th floor, Sayaji Ganj, Lokmanya Tilak Road, Baroda, in the office of the Gujarat Pipeline Project (Oil and Natural Gas Commission). Every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

State—Gujarat	District—Broach	Taluka—Ankleshwar
Village	Survey No.	Area required in Guntha.
Umarvada	282	0·15½
„	281/1	0·10
„	284/3	0·30
„	327	0·5½
„	326	0·6½
„	289	0·1½
„	324	0·11
„	323/1	0·19½
„	308	0·15
„	306/1	0·7
„	306/2	0·11½
„	310	0·1
„	305	0·14
„	304	0·6½
„	296	0·15
„	298	0·18
„	215/2	0·8
„	211	0·2
„	212	0·8
„	213	0·6
„	210	0·8½
„	206/2	0·16½
„	203	0·18
„	202	0·18
Adol	549	2·3
„	548	16·5
„	547	2·5
„	540	35·0
„	539	4·3
„	538	13·0
„	525	19·2
„	524	5·2
„	495	7·5
„		11·0

Village	Survey No.	Area required in Guntha.
Adol .	494	3.8
"	496	6.3
"	492	11.0
"	490	29.0
"	482	21.5
"	449	6.8
"	478	2.5
"	451	0.5
"	452	10.0
"	453	12.5
"	454	8.0
"	455	7.8
"	457	0.5
"	456	11.5
"	417(a)	12.0
"	417(b)	7.8
"	459	5.3
"	416	21.8
"	402	2.3
"	413	5.0
"	404	6.3
"	403	17.5
"	405	1.6
"	349	17.5
"	347	11.5
"	348	4.5
"	64	4.8
"	615	26.5
"	614	
"	617	
"	631(1)	13.5
"	631(2)	10.5
"	635	18.0
"	638	20.0
"	640(3)	7.5
"	641	..
"	642	5.0
"	643	5.0
"	644	17.0
"	532	23.0
"	531	12.5
"	527	20.0
"	525 & 524	10.00
Pilodra	248	4.2
"	249	14.3
"	244	15.5
"	243	27.0
"	235	15.5
"	224	4.0
"	228	17.0
"	227	7.5
"	234	6.7
"	234	14.0
Telva	Village panchayat Road	
"		29
"	30/1	25.7
"	28/1	14.7
"	28/2	14.1
"	22/2	8.9
"	20	8.4
"	19	11.0
"	19	9.5

Village	Survey No.	Area required in Guntha.
Telva— <i>contd.</i>	3	1·6
"	18	14·7
"	6	24·2
"	7	3·1
"	166/1	7·3
"	166/2	13·2
"	165	4·2
Hajat	137	7·0
"	Village panchayat Road	3·0
"	137	10·0
"	177	7·8
"	138	5·3
"	139	19·0
"	147	11·0
"	146	17·0
"	151	11·5
"	151	6·0
"	152	28·5
"	130	17·0
"	125	8·3
"	199	24·5
"	197/1	3·0
"	197/2	18·0
"	198	2·5
"	18	6·0
"	183	16·0
"	182	11·5
"	178	4·0
"	137	8·0
Sarthan	65/3	23·0
"	66/1	15·0
"	74/2	13·0
"	74/3	22·0
"	75	7·5
"	93/1	9·0
"	93/2	8·0
"	92	18·3
"	91	19·5
"	116	16·0
"	117	14·0
"	120	..
"	121	24·0
"	..	27·0

[No. 31/67/63-ONG.]

New Delhi, the 27th April 1965

S.O. 1490.—Whereas by a notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 809 dated the 5th February, 1965 under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipelines;

And whereas the Competent Authority has, under sub-section (i) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And, whereas, the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in lands specified in the Schedule appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (i) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right

of user in the said lands specified in the Schedule appended to this notification is hereby acquired for laying the pipelines and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of that Section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands, shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest on the date of publication of this declaration in the Indian Oil Corporation Limited free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

State—West Bengal

Distt—Midnapore

Thana—Panshkura

Village	Survey Nos. (Plot nos.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey Nos. (Plot Nos.)	Extent (Area)
Babua, J. L. 190	50 56 57 58 132 136 137 139	·12 ·10 ·22 ·03 ·28 ·22 ·21 ·32	Barisha, J. L. 289— <i>contd.</i>	161 162 300 315 316 317 318 319 321 324 745 746 776	·02 ·01 ·02 ·04 ·02 ·02 ·08 ·01 ·03 ·03 ·16 ·10 ·05
Barisha, J. L. 289	155 156 157 159 160	·04 ·11 ·11 ·03 ·11			

[No. 31(33)/63-ONG.Vol. 9.]

New Delhi, the 28th April 1965

S.O. 1491.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum between Barauni Refinery in Bihar State and Kanpur in Uttar Pradesh State pipelines should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited and that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

2. Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein.

3. Any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority at 7/168, Swarupnagar, Kanpur. Every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

State—Uttar Pradesh

District—Allahabad

Tahsil—Chail

Village	Survey No.	Extent
		B-B-B
Asadullapur Rohi	1286	0-1-0

[No. 31/50/63-ONG-Vol. 5.]

S.O. 1492.—Whereas by a notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 396 dated the 20th January, 1965 under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipelines;

And whereas the Competent Authority has, under sub-section (i) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And, whereas, the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in lands specified in the Schedule appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (i) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification is hereby acquired for laying the pipelines and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of that Section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands, shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest on the date of publication of this declaration in the Indian Oil Corporation Limited free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

State—West Bengal			Distt—Burdwan			Thana—Asansol		
Village	Survey Nos. (Plot nos.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey Nos. (Plot nos.)	Extent (Area)			
Dakshin Dad Ka, J.L. 15	230	·08	Ganrui, J. L. 47	1395	·03			
	242	·04		1419	·02			
	472	·08		1420	·02			
	476	·10		1421	·03			
	477	·03		1588	·02			
	478	·05	Raghunathbati, J.L. 46	910	·02			
	481	·05		925	·01			
	482	·08						
	483	·12						
	484	·10	Ramjibanpur, J.L. 47	410	·02			
	525	·005						

[No. 31(33)/63-ONG-Vol.5.]

S.O. 1493.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum between Barauni Refinery in Bihar State and Kanpur in Uttar Pradesh State pipelines should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited and that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

2. Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein.

3. Any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority at 7/166, Swarupnagar, Kanpur. Every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

State—Uttar Pradesh

District—Allahabad

Tahsil—Meja

Village	Survey No.	Extent
---------	------------	--------

B-B-B

Kathauli	732	0 2 5
Bisahjan Khurd	733	0 0 5
	356	0 0 15

[No. 31/50/63-ONG-Vol.8.]

CORRIGENDA

New Delhi, the 26th April 1965

S.O. 1494.—In the Schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 891 dated the 8th March 1965 published in the Gazette of India Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated the 20th March, 1965 in Village Jamira Thana No. 162 following Survey (Plot) numbers with extent in acre shown against each shall be deleted:—

Survey (Plot) No.	Extent in acre
2931	0.025
2932	0.025
2933	0.02
3055	0.05
3064	0.01
2934	0.002
3056	0.001

[No. 31(47)/63-ONG-2/AR.]

New Delhi, the 27th April 1965

S.O. 1495.—In the Schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 819 dated the 2nd March 1965 published in the Gazette of India Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated the 13th March, 1965.

- (i) In Village Mahuli T. No. 107 against Survey No. 243 read extent 0.005 acres instead of "0.00" acres.
- (ii) In village Bahadarpur T. No. 99 against Survey No. 1731 read extent "0.10" acres instead of "0.010" acres.
- (iii) In village Hasanchak T. No. 95 against Survey No. 706 read extent 0.195 acres instead of 0.19 acres and against Survey No. 707 read extent "0.31" acres instead of "0.315" acres.

[No. 31/47/63-ONG-12PAT.]

S.O. 1496.—In the Schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum & Chemicals S.O. No. 817 dated the 2nd March, 1965 published in the Gazette of India Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated the 13th March, 1965 in village Bihat Thana No. 504 against extent "0.13" acres, read Survey Plot No. 7273 instead of 7237.

[No. 31/47/63-ONG-10 Hath.]

S.O. 1497.—In the Schedule to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals S.O. No. 814 dated the 2nd March, 1965 published in the Gazette of India Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated the 13th March, 1965.

In Village Telwa Thana No. 29 (Tola)

- (1) Against Survey No. 1355 *read extent* 0.17 acre instead of "0.175" acre.
- (2) Against Survey No. 1441 *read extent* "0.035" acre instead of "0.03" acres.

[No. 31/47/63-ONG-3A-JAS.]

P. P. GUPTA, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY & SUPPLY

(Department of Industry)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 29th April 1965

S.O. 1498./IDRA/6/21.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 6 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (65 of 1951) read with rules 5(1) and 8 of the Development Councils (Procedural) Rules, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints, till 31st March, 1966, Shri G. R. Kadapa, to be a member of the Development Council established by the Order of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Industry, No. S.O. 1269 dated the 1st April, 1964, for the scheduled industries engaged in the manufacture or production of Textile Machinery and directs that the following amendment shall be made in the said Order, namely:—

In the said Order, for entry No. 16 relating to Shri T. S. Kunchithapatham, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

16. Shri G. R. Kadapa, Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Commerce, New Delhi.

[No. 2(5)/Dev. Councils/64.]

C. BALASUBRAMANIAM, Dy. Secy.

(Department of Industries)

(Indian Standards Institution)

New Delhi, the 28th April 1965

S.O. 1499.—In article covered by licence No. CM/L-639 held by M/s. Power Private Limited, Kalyan, the details of which are given in the Notification published under S.O. 943 in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3(ii), dated 21 March 1964, the following has been included with effect from 1st April, 1965:

PVC Insulated (Heavy Duty) Armoured Cables for Working Voltages Up to and Including 1 100 Volts (With Aluminium Conductors only).

[No. MD/12:1140-A.]

New Delhi, the 28th April 1965

S.O. 1500.—In pursuance of the provisions of sub-rule (2) of rule 3 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Rules, 1955, as amended in 1962, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Indian Standards particulars of which are given in the schedule hereto annexed have been established during the quarter ending 31 March, 1965.

THE SCHEDULE

Serial No.	No. of Indian Standard	Title of Indian Standard
1	IS : 10-1964 . . .	Specification for Plywood Tea-Chests (<i>Second Revision</i>)
2	IS : 250-1964 . . .	Specification for Potassium Bichromate, Technical and Analytical Regent (<i>Revised</i>).

Serial No.	No. of Indian Standard	Title of Indian Standard
3	IS : 285-1964 . . .	Specification for Laundry Soaps (<i>Revised</i>).
4	IS : 368-1963 . . .	Specification for Electric Immersion Water Heaters (<i>Revised</i>).
5	IS : 570-1964 . . .	Methods for Determination of Universal count of Jute Yarn (<i>Revised</i>).
6	IS : 578-1964 . . .	Specification for Full-Chrome Upper Leather (<i>Revised</i>).
7	IS : 590-1964 . . .	Specification for Fixed Paper Dielectric Capacitors for DC (<i>Revised</i>).
8	IS : 613-1964 . . .	Specification for Copper Rods for Electrical Purposes (<i>Revised</i>).
9	IS : 614-1964 . . .	Methods of measurements on Receivers for Amplitude Modulation Broadcast Transmissions (<i>Revised</i>).
10	IS : 659-1964 . . .	Safety Code for Air Conditioning (<i>Revised</i>).
11	IS : 694 (Part I)-1964 . . .	Specification for PVC Insulated Cables (For Voltages Upto 1100 V) Part I with Copper Conductors (<i>Revised</i>).
12	IS : 694 (Part II)-1964 . . .	Specification for PVC Insulated Cables (For Voltage Upto 1100 V) Part II with Aluminium Conductors (<i>Revised</i>).
13	IS : 712-1964 . . .	Specification for Building Limes (<i>Revised</i>).
14	IS : 773-1964 . . .	Specification for Enamelled Cast Iron Water-Closets, Railway Coaching Stock Type (<i>Second Revision</i>).
15	IS : 832-1964 . . .	Method for Determination of Twist in Yarn.
15(a)	IS : 927-1964 . . .	Specification for Fire Hooks (<i>Revised</i>).
16	IS : 990-1964 . . .	Specification for Spoons, Stainless Steel (<i>Revised</i>).
17	IS : 991-1964 . . .	Specification for Spoons, Brass and Nickel Silver (<i>Revised</i>).
18	IS : 1069-1964 . . .	Specification for Water for Storage Batteries (<i>Revised</i>).
19	IS : 1110-1964 . . .	Specification for Ferro Silicon (<i>Revised</i>).
20	IS : 1111-1964 . . .	Specification for Spiegeleisen (<i>Revised</i>).
21	IS : 1171-1964 . . .	Specification for Ferro Manganese (<i>Revised</i>).
22	IS : 1180-1964 . . .	Specification for Outdoor Type Three-Phase Distribution Transformers upto and Including 100 KVA-11 KV (<i>Revised</i>).
23	IS : 1239-1964 . . .	Specification for Mild Steel Tubes and Tubulars (<i>Revised</i>).
24	IS : 1519-(Part II)-1964 . . .	Method for Temperature Measurement of Petroleum and Its products, Part II.
25	IS : 1693-1964 . . .	Specification for Door Mats-Rod (<i>Revised</i>).
26	IS : 2095-1964 . . .	Specification for Gypsum Plaster Boards.
27	IS : 2195-1964 . . .	Code for Inland Packaging of Man-Made Fibre Fabrics and Man-Made Fibre Yarns.
28	IS : 2228-1964 . . .	Specification for Rayon Mix Lining Cloth (<i>Revised</i>).
29	IS : 2480-1964 . . .	Specification for General Purpose Glass Thermometers.
30	IS : 2494-1964 . . .	Specification for V-Belts for Industrial Purposes.
31	IS : 2669-1964 . . .	Specification for Milling Cutters for Woodcuff Keyslots.
32	IS : 2693-1964 . . .	Specification for Cast Iron Flexible Couplings.
33	IS : 2709-1964 . . .	Guide for the Selection of Fits.
34	IS : 2713-1964 . . .	Specification for Tubular Steel Poles for Overhead Power Lines.
35	IS : 2716-1964 . . .	Specification for Myrobalan Extract.

Serial No.	No. of Indian Standard	Title of the Indian Standard
36	IS : 2742-1964 . . .	Specification for Automotive Brake Lining.
37	IS : 2744-1964 . . .	Specification for L-Naphthylamine.
38	IS : 2745-1964 . . .	Specification for Firemen's Helmets.
39	IS : 2755-1964 . . .	Specification for Plain and Interlock Knitted Cotton Vests.
40	IS : 2762-1964 . . .	Specification for Wire Rope Slings and Sling Legs.
41	IS : 2763-1964 . . .	Glossary of Terms Relating to Foundry Technology.
42	IS : 2768-1964 . . .	Specification for Gilding Metal Strip for Bullet Envelopes.
43	IS : 2772-(Part-I)-1964 . . .	Specification for Non-Flameproof Mining Transformers for Use Below Ground Part I Oil Immersed Type.
44	IS : 2778-1964 . . .	Specification for Tomatoes.
45	IS : 2783-1964 . . .	Specification for Worsted Balaclava Caps.
46	IS : 2792-1964 . . .	Code of Practice for Design and Construction of Stone Slab over Joist Floor.
47	IS : 2795-1964 . . .	Specification for Oil Pressure Stoves (Large).
48	IS : 2798-1964 . . .	Method of Test for Polyethylene Containers.
49	IS : 2804-1964 . . .	Dimensions for Palm Grips.
50	IS : 2807-1964 . . .	Specification for Whipcord.
51	IS : 2820-1964 . . .	Specification for Nylon Dobby Crepe.
52	IS : 2821-1964 . . .	Specification for Thermo-sampler.
53	IS : 2822-1964 . . .	Specification for Butter Moulding Machine.
54	IS : 2823-1964 . . .	Specification for Wire Healds for Jacquard Weaving.
55	IS : 2826-1964 . . .	Dimensions for Wrought Copper and Copper Alloy Rods and Bars.
56	IS : 2830-1964 . . .	Specification for Carbon Steel Billets for Re-rolling into Structural Steel (Standard Quality).
57	IS : 2831-1964 . . .	Specification for Carbon Steel Billets for Re-rolling into Structural Steel (Ordinary Quality).
58	IS : 2849-1964 . . .	Specification for Nonload Bearing Gypsum Partition Blocks (Solid and Hollow Types).
59	IS : 2850-1964 . . .	Specification for Zinc oxide for Cosmetic Industry.
60	IS : 2852-1964 . . .	Specification for Carpenters' Augers.
61	IS : 2855-1964 . . .	Method of Test for Determining Flexivity of Thermostat Metals.
62	IS : 2858-1964 . . .	Code of Practice for Roofing with Mangalore Tiles.
63	IS : 2861-1964 . . .	Specification for Diazinon Emulsifiable Concentrates.
64	IS : 2862-1964 . . .	Specification for Diazinon Water Dispersible Powder Concentrates.
65	IS : 2864-1964 . . .	Specification for Chlordane Dusting Powders.
66	IS : 2865-1964 . . .	Specification for Methyl Parathion Emulsifiable Concentrates.
67	IS : 2870-1964 . . .	Specification for Charge Pump for Pressure, Retaining Knapsack Sprayer.
68	IS : 2871-1964 . . .	Specification for Branch Pipe, Universal, For Fire Fighting Purposes.
69	IS : 2878-1964 . . .	Specification for Portable Fire Extinguishers, Carbon-Dioxide Type.
70	IS : 2879-1964 . . .	Specification for Mild Steel for Metal Arc Welding Electrode Core Wire.
71	IS : 2884-1964 . . .	Specification for Dried and Laminated Bombay Duck.

Serial No.	No. of Indian Standard	Title of Indian Standard
72	IS : 2885-1964 . . .	Specification for Frozen Frog Legs.
73	IS : 2890-1964 . . .	Dimensions for Taper Handles for Machine Tools.
74	IS : 2891-1964 . . .	Specification for Wooden Handles for Felling Axes and Hand Axes.
75	IS : 2893-1964 . . .	Specification for Wooden Handles for Adzes.
76	IS : 2904-1964 . . .	Dimensions for Ball Handles.
77	IS : 2909-1964 . . .	Dimensions for Star Grips.
78	IS : 2910-1964 . . .	Specification for Shuttles for Jute Broad Looms.
79	IS : 2936-1964 . . .	Specification for Seeds of Carrot.
80	IS : 2970-1964 . . .	Specification for Cotton Fabrics for Supply-Dropping Parachutes.

[No. MD/13:3]

S.O. 1501—In pursuance of sub-regulations (2) and (3) of regulation 3 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, as amended in 1961, 1962 and 1964, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Indian Standard(s), particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been established during the period 23 April to 27th April 1965.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. and Title of the Indian Standard Established	No. and Title of the Indian Standard or Standards, if any superseded by the new Indian Standard	Brief Particulars
1	2	3	4
1	IS : 171-1964 Specification for Cotton Yarn, Grey (<i>Revised</i>).	IS : 171-1951 Specification for Cotton Yarn, Grey (<i>Tentative</i>).	This standard prescribes count, count-strength-product (French and yarn strength Index (YSI) of grey cotton yarn intended for use in powerlooms. (Price Rs. 1.50).
2	IS : 247-1964 Specification for Sodium Sulphite, Anhydrous (<i>Second Revision</i>).	IS : 247-1957 Specification for Anhydrous Sodium Sulphite (<i>Revised</i>).	This standard prescribes the requirements and the methods of sampling and test for sodium sulphite, anhydrous. (Price Rs. 3.50).
3	IS : 392-1964 Method for Measuring the Water Absorption And Penetration In Water-Resistant Fabrics (Permeable to Air) By a Bundesmann Type Apparatus (<i>Revised</i>).	IS : 392-1952 Method for Measuring The Water Absorption and Penetration in Water-Resistant Fabrics (Permeable to Air) By a Bundesmann Type Apparatus (<i>Tentative</i>).	This standard prescribes a method for measuring resistance to wetting (in terms of water absorbed) and resistance to penetration by water (in terms of water penetrated) of water-resistant fabrics (permeable to air) by the Bundesmanntester (Price Rs. 2.50).
4	IS : 928-1964 Specification for Fire Bell (<i>Revised</i>).	IS : 928-1958 Specification for Fire Bell.	This standard lays down the requirements regarding materials, shape and dimensions manufacture, workmanship and finish, and performance test of 250 mm diameter fire bell. (Price Rs. 1.50).

1	2	3	4
5	IS : 1035-1964 Methods of Sampling And Test For Bleaching Earths (<i>Revised</i>).	IS : 1035-1957 Methods of Sampling and Test for Bleaching Earths Used for Decolorizing Vegetable Oils.	This standard prescribes the methods of sampling and test for bleaching earths. It covers the methods for determining moisture, bulk density, sieve analysis acidity or alkalinity, decolorizing power, filtrability, oil retention and ash. (Price Rs. 4.00).
6	IS : 1543-1964 Specification for Single Cylinder Fuel Injection Pumps (<i>Revised</i>).	IS : 1543-1960 Specification for single Cylinder Fuel Injection Pumps.	This standard covers the requirements for three types of single cylinder, constant stroke fuel injection plunger pumps without integral camshafts. (Price Rs. 2.00).
7	IS : 2106 (Part VII)-1964 Environmental Tests for Electronic Equipment Part VII: Bump Test.	..	This standard (Part VII) gives details of the procedure for bump test as part of the environmental testing of electronic equipment and other equipment employing similar techniques (Price Rs. 1.00).
8	IS : 2253-1964 Types of Construction and Mounting of Motors.	..	This standard covers types of construction and details of mounting of motors of all types of enclosures (Price Rs. 3.00).
9	IS : 2470 (Part II)-1964 Code of Practice for Design and Construction of Septic Tanks. Part II Large Installations.	..	This code lays down the recommendations for the design, layout, construction and maintenance of septic tanks and includes methods of treatment and disposal of septic tank effluent. It is applicable to residential housing colonies, hostels, boarding schools where the number of users range from 50 to 300. Capacities and sizes required for 50, 100, 140, 200 and 300 persons are recommended to facilitate selection of sizes of septic tanks. (Price Rs. 3.00).
10	IS : 2542 (Part I)-1964 Methods of Test for Gypsum Plaster, Concrete and Products.	..	This standard covers the methods for carrying out the following tests on gypsum Plaster and gypsum concrete
	Part I Plaster and Concrete.		
			Method of test Clause No
			(a) Normal consistency of gypsum plasters 4
			(b) Normal consistency of gypsum concrete 5
			(c) Setting time of plasters and concrete 6
			(d) Transverse strength of gypsum plasters 7

(1)	(2)	(3)
		<p>(e) Compressive strength of gypsum plaster 8.</p> <p>(f) Soundness of gypsum plaster 9.</p> <p>(g) Mechanical resistance of gypsum plaster 10.</p> <p>(h) Freedom from coarse particles 11.</p> <p>(j) Expansion of plaster 12.</p> <p>(k) Sand in set plaster 13.</p> <p>(m) Wood fibre content in woodfibre gypsum plaster 14 (Price Rs. 5.00)</p>
11 IS : 2566-1965 Specification for B-Twill Jute Bags (Revised)	IS : 2566-1963 Specification for B-Twill Jute Bags (For Packing Food-grains)	This standard prescribes the constructional details and other particulars of B-Twill jute bags of dimension 112 × 67.5 cm (or 44 × 26½ in.) (Price Rs. 2.50)
12 IS : 2740-1964 Specification for Sulphanilic Acid, Technical	..	This standard prescribes the requirements and the methods of sampling and test for sulphanilic acid, technical (Price Rs. 3.00)
13 IS : 2747-1964 Performance Requirements for Taximeters.	..	This standard covers the performance requirements for taximeters to determine charges for hire of motor cabs. (Price Rs. 2.00)
14 IS : 2857-1964 Specification for Earthenware Dinnerware	..	This standard prescribes the requirements and the methods of sampling and test for the dinnerware made of earthenware (Price Rs. 1.50)
15 IS : 2860-1964 Methods of Sampling and Test for Processed Fruits and Vegetables	..	This standard prescribes the methods of sampling and test for processed fruits and vegetables (Price Rs. 6.00)
16 IS : 2880-1964 Specification for Pressure Sensitive Adhesive Cellulose Tape	..	This standard prescribes the requirements and the methods of sampling and test for pressure sensitive adhesive cellulose tapes suitable for temporary applications. (Price Rs. 3.00)
17 IS : 2881-1964 Specification for Barytes for Chemical Industry and Oil Well Drilling	..	This standard prescribes the requirements and methods of test for the material commercially known as barytes intended for the preparation of barium compounds and for oil well drilling (Price Rs. 2.50)
18 IS : 2882-1964 Specification for Camel Hair Druggets for Export.	..	This standard prescribes constructional details and other particulars of hand-made camel hair druggets for export. (Price Rs. 2.00)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
19	IS : 2886-1964 Specification for Labelling Paste for Automatic Machines.	..	This standard prescribes the requirements and the methods of sampling and test for labelling paste to be used on automatic machines. (Price Rs. 2.00)
20	IS : 2900-1964 Specification for Different Grades/Classes of Raw Wool for Internal Consumption.	..	This standard prescribes specifications for different grades/classes of raw wool for internal consumption. (Price Rs. 2.00)
21	IS : 2901-1964 Specification for Handloom Woollen Blanket, Scarlet.	..	This standard prescribes constructional details and other particulars of handloom woollen blanket, scarlet. (Price Rs. 2.00)
22	IS : 2917-1964 Specification for Umbrella Ribs.	..	This standard covers the requirements for finished umbrella ribs, both main and stretcher (Price Rs. 2.50)
23	IS : 2919-1964 Specification for Umbrella Fittings.	..	This standard covers the requirements for umbrella fittings namely, runner, notch, cap and ferrule. (Price Rs. 2.00)
24	IS : 2920-1964 Specification for Umbrellas.	..	This standard covers the requirements for complete umbrellas. (Price Rs. 1.50)
25	IS : 2929-1964 Specification for Bushes for Bottom Shaft, Rocking Shaft and Crank Shaft Used on Plain Calico Looms.	..	This standard prescribes the requirements of bushes for bottom shaft, rocking shaft and crank shaft used on plain calico overpick looms. (Price Rs. 1.00)
26	IS : 2940-1964 Specification for V-Blocks.	..	This standard specifies the size ^s and accuracies of two grades ^s namely, Grade A and Grade B of V-Blocks. It applies to either single V-Blocks or matched pairs of both grades. (Price Rs. 2.00).
27	IS : 2954-1964 Specification for Vegetable Tanned Leather for Belting.	..	This standard prescribes the requirements and the methods of test for vegetable tanned leather used for flat and round leather beltings. (Price Rs. 3.00)
28	IS : 2963-1964 Specification for Non-Ferrous Waste Fittings for Wash-Basins and Sinks.	..	This standard covers the requirements for material, manufacture and workmanship, nominal sizes and dimensions, and finish of non-ferrous waste fittings used in wash-basins and sinks (Price Rs. 1.50)
29	IS : 2964-1964 Methods for Detection and Estimation of Damage in Cotton Fibres due to Micro-Organisms.	..	This standard prescribes method ^s for the detection and estimation of damage in cotton fibres due to micro-organisms. (Price Rs. 2.00)
30	IS : 2965-1965 Specification for Internal Micrometers (including Stick Micrometers).	..	(1) Section A applies to internal micrometers of a measuring range up to 600 mm. comprising a measuring head, extension rods with or without spacing collars and, in the smaller sizes a handle. (Rs. 3.00)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
			<p>(2) Section B applies to stick micrometers, which are designed for the measurement of longer internal lengths and comprise the following parts :</p> <p>(a) A 150-mm or 300-mm micrometer unit fitted with micrometer of 25 mm range and having rounded terminal faces, and</p> <p>(b) A series of extension rods which together with the micrometer unit, permit of a continuous range of measurement up to the maximum length required.</p>
31	IS: 2957-1964 Specification for External Micrometers.	..	This standard relates to external micrometers of a measuring range of 25 mm and unit of graduation of 0.01 mm, used in general engineering practice. (Price Rs. 2.50)
32	IS : 2977-1965 Methods for Determination of Dimensional changes of woven fabrics (Other than Wool) on Soaking in Water.	..	This standard prescribes a method for determination of dimensional changes of woven fabrics other than made of wool, on soaking in water. Price Rs. 1.50
33	IS: 2987-1965 Recommendations for Direction of operation of Controls for Machine Tools.	..	This standard lays down the direction of operation of controls for setting in motion corresponding machine tools parts when the controls are hand operated. (Price Re. 1.00)
34	IS: 2995-1965 Dimensions for Set Collars.	..	This standard specifies the material and dimensions for set collars in the light series for shafts from 2 mm to 200 mm diameter and in the heavy series for shafts from 10 mm to 150 mm diameter (Price Rs. 2.00)
35	IS: 3000-1965 Specification for Seeds of Turnip	..	This standard prescribes the requirements for seeds of turnip (<i>Brassica rapa L</i>) (Price Re. 1.00)
6	IS: 3002-1965 Specification for Seeds of Radish.	..	This standard prescribes the requirements for seeds of radish (<i>Raphanus Sativus L</i>) (Price Re. 1.00).

Copies of these Indian Standards are available for sale, with the Indian Standards Institution Manak Bhavan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-1 and also its branch offices at (i) Bombay Mutual Terrace, First Floor, 534 Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel Road, Bombay-7, (ii) Third and Fourth Floors, 5 Chowringhee Approach, Calcutta-13, (iii) Second Floor, Sathyamurthy Bhavan, 54 General Patters Road, Madras-2 and (iv) 14/69 Civil Lines, Kanpur.

New Delhi, the 29th April 1965

S. O. 1502—In pursuance of sub-regulation (3) of regulation 7 of the Indian Standard Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, as amended in 1961, 1962 and 1964, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the marking fee per unit for Roasted Chicory Powder details of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, has been determined and the fee shall come into force with effect from 1 May 1965.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Product/Class of Products	No. and title of relevant Indian Standard	Unit	Marking Fee per Unit
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I.	Roasted Chicory Powder	IS : 612-1962 Specification for Roasted Chicory Powder.	One Metric Tonne	Rs. 2.00

[No. MD/18 : 2.]

D. V. KARMARKAR,
Jt. Director (Marks).

CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES

INCOME-TAX

New Delhi, the 28th April 1965

S.O. 1503.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 122 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and of all other powers enabling it in that behalf and in supersession of all the previous notifications in this regard, the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby directs that the Appellate Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax of the Ranges specified in column 1 of the Schedule below, shall perform their functions in respect of all persons and incomes assessed to Income-tax or Super-tax in the Income-tax Circles, Wards and Districts specified in the corresponding entry in column 2 thereof:—

SCHEDULE

Range 1	Income-tax Circles, Wards and Districts. 2
A-Range, Hyderabad.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A-Ward, Hyderabad. 2. I.T.-cum-W.T.I, Hyderabad. 3. C-Ward, Hyderabad. 4. I.T.-cum-W.T.III, Hyderabad. 5. Salaries Circle, Hyderabad. 6. Nizamabad 7. Khammam.
B-Range, Hyderabad.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Special Investigation Circle, Hyderabad. 2. B-Ward, Hyderabad. 3. I.T.-cum-W.T.II, Hyderabad. 4. Companies Circle, Hyderabad. 5. M.P.P. Circle, Hyderabad. 6. Special Survey Circle I, Hyderabad. 7. Special Survey Circle II, Hyderabad. 8. Warangal. 9. Karimnagar. 10. Mahboobnagar.

1

2

Visakhapatnam.

1. Visakhapatnam.
2. Vizianagaram.
3. Anakapalli.
4. Srikakulam.
5. Ramachandrapuram.
6. Kakinada.
7. Palakol.

Rajahmundry.

1. Rajahmundry.
2. Tenali.
3. Eluru.

Nellore.

1. Nellore.
2. Mica Circle, Nellore.
3. Chittoor.
4. Tirupathi.
5. Bapla.
6. Cuddapah.
7. Proddatur.

Anantapur.

1. Anantapur.
2. Adoni.
3. Kurnool.

Vijayawada.

1. Vijayawada.
2. Masulipatam.
3. Guntur.
4. Gudivada.

Where an Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof stands transferred by this notification from one Range to another Range, appeals arising out of assessments made in that Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof and pending immediately before the date of this notification before the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax of the Range from whom that Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred shall, from the date of this notification shall take effect, be transferred to and dealt with by the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range to whom the said Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred.

This notification shall take effect from the 14th May, 1965.

Explanatory Note

The amendments have become necessary on account of creation of a new Range known as Rajahmundry Range in the Commissioner's Charge and transfer of Headquarters of AAC, Kurnool to Anantapur.

(This note does not form a part of the notification but is intended to be merely clarificatory.)

[No. 33 (F. No. 50/53/65-ITJ).]

T. N. PANDEY, Under Secy.